arXiv:1602.08259v2 [math.AP] 13 Oct 2016

DERIVATION OF LIMIT EQUATION FOR A PERTURBED 3D PERIODIC BOUSSINESQ SYSTEM.

STEFANO SCROBOGNA

Abstract. We consider the perturbed Boussinesq system (PBS_ε) in a periodic domain $\mathbb{T}^3$ and we prove that, as $\varepsilon \to 0$ it converges (in the sense of distributions) to a limit system which can be written as a 2d-stratified incompressible Navier-Stokes equation with additional vertical diffusion $-\nu\partial_3^2$ plus a linear equation, for almost all three-dimensional tori. Under suitable hypothesis on the initial data we prove moreover that the 2d-stratified incompressible Navier-Stokes equation with full diffusion is globally well posed in $H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), \sigma > 0$ without any smallness assumption on the initial data. If the initial data is sufficiently regular ($H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), s > 1/2$) we use a suitable change of variables known as "Schochet method" to prove that, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small the (local) solutions of (PBS_ε) are in fact global-in-time without any smallness assumption on the initial data, and tend (strongly) as $\varepsilon \to 0$ to the (strong, global) solutions of the limit system mentioned above.

1. Introduction.

In the present article we study the behavior of strong solutions of the following modified Boussinesq system

$$(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla v^\varepsilon - \nu\Delta v^\varepsilon - \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\theta^\varepsilon \overrightarrow{e}_3 &= -\dfrac{1}{\varepsilon}\nabla\Phi^\varepsilon, \\ \partial_t \theta^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla\theta^\varepsilon - \nu'\Delta\theta^\varepsilon + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon}v^{3,\varepsilon} &= 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v^\varepsilon = 0, \\ \left(v^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon\right)|_{t=0} = \left(v_0, \theta_0\right), \end{cases}$$

for data which are periodic-in-space in the regime $\varepsilon \to 0$. The space variable x shall be many times considered separately with respect to the horizontal and vertical components, i.e. $x = (x_h, x_3) = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$. In the present paper we denote $\Delta = \partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2 + \partial_3^2$ the standard laplacian, $\Delta_h = \partial_1^2 + \partial_2^2$ is the laplacian in the horizontal directions, as well as $\nabla_h = (\partial_1, \partial_2)^\intercal, \nabla_h^\perp = (-\partial_2, \partial_1)^\intercal$. In the same way the symbol ∇ represents the gradient in all space directions $\nabla = (\partial_1, \partial_2, \partial_3)$. Considered a vector field w we denote $\operatorname{div} w = \partial_1 w^1 + \partial_2 w^2 + \partial_3 w^3$. Given two three-components vector fields w, z the notation $w \cdot \nabla z$ indicates the operator

$$w \cdot \nabla z = \sum_{i=1}^{3} w^i \partial_i z.$$

Generally for any two-components vector field $u = \left(u^1, u^2\right)$ we shall denote as $u^\perp = \left(-u^2, u^1\right)$. The viscosity ν, ν' above are strictly positive constants $\nu, \nu' \geqslant c > 0$ We give in what follows a short physical justification of the system (PBS_ε). We start considering the equations governing the

motion of viscous ($\nu, \nu' \geqslant c > 0$), density-dependent fluid at a planetary scale (primitive equations)

$$\text{(P-I)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v^1 + v \cdot \nabla v^1 - \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Ro}} v^2 &= - p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_1 \phi + \nu \Delta v^1, \\ \partial_t v^2 + v \cdot \nabla v^1 + \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Ro}} v^1 &= - p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_2 \phi + \nu \Delta v^2, \\ \partial_t v^3 + v \cdot \nabla v^3 + \Gamma\, \theta &= - p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_3 \phi + \nu \Delta v^3, \\ \partial_t \theta + v \cdot \nabla \theta - \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Fr}^2\, \Gamma} u^3 &= \nu' \Delta \theta, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0. \end{cases}$$

In (P-I) $v = \left(v^1, v^2, v^3\right)$ represents the velocity flow of the fluid, and $\Gamma, \mathrm{Ro}, \mathrm{Fr}$ are positive constants which have a physical relevance. They will be defined precisely in what follows. The density in particular is considered to be a slight oscillation from a stationary state for a strongly stratified fluid (such as the oceans or the troposphere), i.e. we consider the full density $\rho = \rho\,(t, x) = \rho\,(t, x_h, x_3)$

$$\rho\,(t, x_h, x_3) = \rho_0 + \bar{\rho}\,(x_3) + \theta\,(t, x_h, x_3)\,,$$

and

$$|\theta| \ll |\bar{\rho}| \ll |\rho_0|\,,$$

i.e. the fluid density ρ is slight oscillation around the constant state ρ_0 whose main variation $\bar{\rho}$ is along the x_3 axis due to gravitational stratification effects and on which acts a different variation of density θ which can be arbitrary.
The term p_0 appearing in (P-I) is called the *reference pressure*. For static gases the *reference density* and the *reference absolute temperature* ρ_0, T_0 are given physical quantities. For adiabatic gases the equation of state and the conservation law read as

$$\begin{cases} p = R \rho T, \\ \dfrac{p}{p_0} = \left(\dfrac{\rho}{\rho_0}\right)^{\gamma}, \end{cases}$$

for $\gamma > 1$, hence the reference pressure is defined as $p_0 = R \rho_0 T_0$ with R physical constant depending on the gas. The above laws hence give us the variation of the absolute temperature with respect to the density, i.e.

$$T = \frac{T_0}{\rho_0^{\gamma - 1}}\, \rho^{\gamma - 1}.$$

The derivation of (P-I) is not completely trivial, for this reason we refer the reader to [17, Chapter 11, 15]. We point out though that there are two intrinsic features which characterize a motion described by a system of the form (P-I)

- The skew-symmetric perturbation $\left(v^1, v^2\right) \mapsto \mathrm{Ro}^{-1} \left(-v^2, v^1\right)$ acting on the first two components of (P-I). This linear force is a rotational force acting along an axis which is parallel to the x_3 axis. It describes relatively well the effect of the Coriolis force locally on mid-latitude regions. Ro is called the *Rossby number*, and it is a physical magnitude describing the importance of the earth rotation on the system. We shall define it in detail in what follows.
- The second one is the linear application $\left(v^3, \theta\right) \mapsto \left(\Gamma\theta, - \left(\mathrm{Fr}^2\, \Gamma\right)^{-1} v^3\right)$. This application describes the force which is applied due to stratification of the fluid. Namely, let us consider a (static) fluid whose density is decreasing along the vertical direction. This hypothesis is completely natural since layer with higher density are heavier, and the gravity tends to minimize the gravitational potential, moving them below the layers which are lighter.

Suppose to move a volume of heavier fluid in a region of low density. Indeed the gravitation will tend to restore the stratification, hence the "high density volume" will tend to move down. Once it reaches the layers whose density are comparable to his he will not stop immediately, but by inertial force he will tend to go below it, until Archimedes' principle will provide sufficient buoyancy to invert such motion.
The application $\left(v^3, \theta\right) \mapsto \left(\Gamma\theta, -\left(\mathrm{Fr}^2\,\Gamma\right)^{-1} v^3\right)$ describes in fact the rate with which this process takes place, Γ is physical quantity of the system which we chose to be

$$\Gamma \approx \frac{1}{\mathrm{Fr}},$$

hence the stratification force becomes

$$\left(v^3, \theta\right) \mapsto \left(\frac{\theta}{\mathrm{Fr}}, -\frac{v^3}{\mathrm{Fr}}\right).$$

The quantity Fr is said the *Froude number* and measures the stratification of a fluid. We shall define it in detail in what follows.

With these considerations above the equations (P-I) become

$$\text{(P-II)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v^1 + v \cdot \nabla v^1 - \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Ro}} v^2 &= -\,p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_1 \phi + \nu \Delta v^1, \\ \partial_t v^2 + v \cdot \nabla v^1 + \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Ro}} v^1 &= -\,p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_2 \phi + \nu \Delta v^2, \\ \partial_t v^3 + v \cdot \nabla v^3 + \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Fr}} \theta &= -\,p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_3 \phi + \nu \Delta v^3, \\ \partial_t \theta + v \cdot \nabla \theta - \dfrac{1}{\mathrm{Fr}} v^3 &= \nu' \Delta \theta, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0. \end{cases}$$

As we said before the system (P-II) describes the motion of a fluid on which are present rotational and stratification effects. The rotating motion which induces the Coriolis force is indeed bestowed of a certain (angular) frequency, which we shall denote as Ω. On the other hand once a stratification equilibrium is broken we induce a vertical pulsating motion of frequency, say, N (during all this paper we shall consider N to be constant). This is known in the literature as the Brunt-Väisälä frequency.
We can indeed associate to Ω, N the following quantities

$$T_\Omega = \frac{1}{\Omega}, \qquad\qquad T_N = \frac{1}{N},$$

which are respectively the *period of rotation* and the *period of stratification*. The system (P-II) describes hence how the rotation and gravity tend to restore this horizontal-vertical equilibrium in a timescale T, where Ro and Fr are respectively defined as

$$\mathrm{Ro} = \frac{T_\Omega}{T}, \qquad\qquad \mathrm{Fr} = \frac{T_N}{T}.$$

The short introduction given above explains that in fact (P-II) is a family of systems, whose asymptotic varies accordingly to the ratio Ro/Fr. In the present paper we are interested to study the regime

$$T_N \ll T \ll T_\Omega,$$

hence we *suppose* that the stratification effects have a frequency $N \gg \Omega$ and we focus in a timescale T which is significantly bigger than T_N but still irrelevant respect to T_Ω, with these hypotheses

hence the physical numbers Fr, Ro becomes

$$\mathrm{Ro} \gg 1, \qquad\qquad \mathrm{Fr} \approx 0,$$

setting $\mathrm{Fr} = \varepsilon$, and, omitting the term $\left(-\mathrm{Ro}^{-1} v^2, \mathrm{Ro}^{-1} v^1\right)$ since $1/\mathrm{Ro} \approx 0$ we simplify the primitive equations to the following form

$$\text{(P-III)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v^1 + v \cdot \nabla v^1 & = -\, p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_1 \phi + \nu \Delta v^1, \\ \partial_t v^2 + v \cdot \nabla v^1 & = -\, p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_2 \phi + \nu \Delta v^2, \\ \partial_t v^3 + v \cdot \nabla v^3 + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta & = -\, p_0 \dfrac{1}{\rho_0} \partial_3 \phi + \nu \Delta v^3, \\ \partial_t \theta + v \cdot \nabla \theta - \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} v^3 & = \nu' \Delta \theta, \\ \operatorname{div} v = 0. \end{cases}$$

Indeed the solutions of (P-III) depend on the Froude number ε, for this reason from now on

$$(v, \theta) = \left(v^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon\right),$$

and

$$\frac{p_0}{\rho_0}\, \phi = \Phi^\varepsilon.$$

The goal of the present paper is to study the behavior of (strong) solutions of (P-III) in the regime $\varepsilon \to 0$ for periodic-in-space data, i.e. given $a_i > 0, i = 1, 2, 3$ we consider the domain

$$\mathbb{T}^3 = \prod_{i=1}^{3} \left[0, 2\pi\ a_i\right],$$

and we look for a divergence-free vector field $v^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and a scalar function $\theta^\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $(v^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon)$ solves

$$\text{(PBS}_\varepsilon\text{)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla v^\varepsilon - \nu \Delta v^\varepsilon - \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \theta^\varepsilon \overrightarrow{e}_3 & = & -\dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla \Phi^\varepsilon, \\ \partial_t \theta^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \theta^\varepsilon - \nu' \Delta \theta^\varepsilon + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} v^{3,\varepsilon} & = & 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v^\varepsilon = 0, \end{cases}$$

where the functions depend on $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3$. The system $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$ belongs to a much wider family of problems which may be written in the following general form

$$\text{(1.1)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t V^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla V^\varepsilon + A_2\left(D\right) V^\varepsilon + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{S}\left(V^\varepsilon\right) = 0, \\ V(0, x) = V_0(x), \end{cases}$$

where A_2 is an elliptic operator and $\mathcal{S}$ is skew-symmetric.
The problem of systems with skew symmetric singular perturbation is not at all new in the literature. S. Klainerman and A. Majda in [24] give at first a generic theory for hyperbolic nonlinear systems with singular perturbations.
It may be interesting to notice that, as mentioned above, varying the ratio Ro/Fr we can deduce many different systems which are already well known.
Let us suppose, for instance, that the fluid considered is viscid, and *completely homogeneous*, i.e. its density is a constant value ρ_0. Being absent any variation of density it lacks the physical mean to have stratification effects, i.e. stratification effect does not occur. This in turn implies that $T_N = \infty$

and $\mathrm{Fr} = \infty$. It is easy to deduce hence that, in a timescale $T \gg T_\Omega$ (hence $\mathrm{Ro} = \varepsilon \approx 0$) the flow shall evolve accordingly to the following law (Navier-Stokes -Coriolis equations)

$$(\mathrm{RF}_\varepsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}} + v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}} \cdot \nabla v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}} - \nu \Delta v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}} + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} e^3 \wedge v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}} = -\dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla p^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}}, \\ v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF}}(0,x) = v^\varepsilon_{\mathrm{RF},0}(x). \end{cases}$$

A. Babin A. Mahalov and B.Nicolaenko studied at first the equation $(\mathrm{RF}_\varepsilon)$ in the periodic setting in a series of work (such as [2], [3] , this list is non exhaustive), in which they took full advantage of the absence of resonance between "completely 3D interactions". We shall exploit this method as well in order to obtain a well posedness result, for detail we refer to Lemma 4.7. In the same time and independently E. Grenier in [21] proved a global weak convergence statement of solutions of $(\mathrm{RF}_\varepsilon)$ to those of a limit system which may be written in the form $(\mathcal{S}_0)$.
Finally in [20] I. Gallagher studied systems in an even more generic form that (1.1), giving a generic theory for the convergence of parabolic systems with singular perturbation in periodic domains. This allowed her to obtain some global strong convergence results for rapidly rotating fluids $(\mathrm{RF}_\varepsilon)$ and the primitive equations $(\mathrm{PE}_\varepsilon)$.

Let us mention as well some results in the whole space, Chemin et al. in [14] proved global strong convergence of solutions of $(\mathrm{RF}_\varepsilon)$ with only horizontal viscosity $-\nu_h \Delta_h$ instead of the full viscosity $-\nu\Delta$ to a purely 2D Navier-Stokes system in the case in which $\varepsilon \to 0$, moreover they improved in [15] the result of Grenier and Masmoudi [22] of the convergence of solutions of $(\mathrm{RF}_\varepsilon)$ between tho rigid layers with Dirichelet boundary conditions.

Another interesting system which can be derived from a multi-scale analysis of the ratio Ro/Fr is the case

$$\frac{\mathrm{Ro}}{\mathrm{Fr}} = \frac{1}{F}, \qquad F \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence in this case stratification and rotation have comparable frequencies, it is easy to deduce hence that the system derived in this case is the following one

$$(\mathrm{PE}_\varepsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t V^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} + v^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} \cdot \nabla V^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} - \mathbb{D} V^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}} + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(-V^{2,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad V^{1,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad \frac{1}{F} V^{4,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad -\frac{1}{F} V^{3,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}} \right)^{\mathsf{T}} \\ \qquad\qquad = -\dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\nabla \Phi^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}, \quad 0 \right)^{\mathsf{T}}, \\ V^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P}}(0,x) = V^\varepsilon_{\mathcal{P},0}(x), \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbb{D}$ is defined in (1.2). J.-Y. Chemin studied the system $(\mathrm{PE}_\varepsilon)$ in the case $F \equiv 1$ in [11] obtaining a global existence result under a smallness condition made only on a part of the initial data. He proved in fact that, setting $\Omega^\varepsilon = -\partial_2 v^{1,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}} + \partial_1 v^{2,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}} - F \partial_3 v^{4,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{P}}$ the system $(\mathrm{PE}_\varepsilon)$ converges to what it is known as the quasi-geostrophic system, i.e.

$$(\mathrm{QG}) \qquad \partial_t V_{\mathrm{QG}} - \Gamma V_{\mathrm{QG}} + \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_2 \\ \partial_1 \\ 0 \\ -F\partial_3 \end{pmatrix} \Delta^{-1} \left(V^h_{\mathrm{QG}} \cdot \nabla_h \Omega^\varepsilon \right) = 0,$$

where $V_{\mathrm{QG}} = \left(V^h_{\mathrm{QG}}, V^3_{\mathrm{QG}}, V^4_{\mathrm{QG}} \right) = \left(-\partial_2 \Delta^{-1} \Omega, \partial_1 \Delta^{-1} \Omega, 0, -F \partial_3 \Delta^{-1} \Omega \right)$ and Γ is an elliptic operator of order two defined as

$$\Gamma = \frac{\Delta \left(\nu \Delta_h + \nu' \partial_3^2 \right)}{\Delta_h + F^2 \partial_3^2}.$$

I. Gallagher proved strong convergence of solutions of (PE_ε) to a limit system in the form ($\mathcal{S}_0$) in the periodic case always in the work [20], F. Charve proved first weak convergence of solutions of (PE_ε) to solution of (QG) in [8], and strong convergence in [7]. The case in which the system (PE_ε) presents only horizontal diffusion, hence it is a mixed parabolic hyperbolic type has been studied by Charve and Ngo in [9] in the whole space in the case $\nu_h = \nu_h^\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^\alpha)$, $\alpha > 0$ and by the author in [29] in the periodic case when the horizontal viscosity is strictly positive.

We mention as well work of D. Bresch, D. Gérard-Varet and E. Grenier [6]. In this work the authors consider the primitive equations in te form

$$(\widetilde{\mathrm{PE}}_\varepsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t v_P^\varepsilon + u_P^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla v_P^\varepsilon - \nu \Delta v_P^\varepsilon + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} e^3 \wedge v_P^\varepsilon = -\dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \nabla_h \phi_P^\varepsilon, \\ \partial_3 \phi_P^\varepsilon = \theta_P^\varepsilon \\ \mathrm{div}_h \; v_P^\varepsilon = -\partial_3 w_P^\varepsilon, \\ \partial_t \theta_P^\varepsilon + u_P^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla \theta_P^\varepsilon - \nu' \Delta \theta_P^\varepsilon + w_P^\varepsilon = Q, \\ u_P^\varepsilon = (v_P^\varepsilon, w_P^\varepsilon). \end{cases}$$

The methodology used in [6] although is completely different respect to the other works mentioned. The penalization in particular is *not skew-symmetric*, this prevents the authors to apply energy methods as in the other works mentioned.

We are interested in the dynamics of the system (PBS_ε) in the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the periodic case. Recently K. Widmayer in [31] proved that, in the whole space and for the inviscid case, the limit system solves a two dimensional incompressible stratified Euler equation

$$\text{(E-2D)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}_{\mathrm{E}}^h + \bar{u}_{\mathrm{E}}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}_{\mathrm{E}}^h + \nabla_h \bar{p}_{\mathrm{E}} = 0, \\ \mathrm{div}_{\,h} \bar{u}_{\mathrm{E}}^h = 0. \end{cases}$$

His proof relied on the fact that, in the whole space $\mathbb{R}^3$ the highly perturbative part of the solution decay at infinity as $\varepsilon \to 0$. In our case this can not happen and in fact we shall see that there is constructive interaction.
Let us rewrite the system (PBS_ε) into the following more compact form

$$(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t V^\varepsilon + v^\varepsilon \cdot \nabla V^\varepsilon - \mathbb{D} V^\varepsilon + \dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{A} V^\varepsilon = -\dfrac{1}{\varepsilon} \begin{pmatrix} \nabla \Phi^\varepsilon \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ V^\varepsilon = (v^\varepsilon, \theta^\varepsilon), \\ \mathrm{div}\; v^\varepsilon = 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$(1.2) \qquad \mathcal{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathbb{D} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu\Delta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \nu\Delta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \nu\Delta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \nu'\Delta \end{pmatrix}.$$

1.1. **Notation and results.** All along this note we consider real valued vector fields, i.e. applications $V : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^4$. We will often associate to a vector field V the vector field v which shall be simply the projection on the first three components of V. The vector fields considered are periodic in all their directions and they have zero global average $\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} V \mathrm{d}x = 0$, which is equivalent to assume that the first Fourier coefficient $\hat{V}(0) = 0$. We remark that the zero average propriety stated above is preserved in time t for both Navier-Stokes equations as well as for the system (PBS_ε).

Let us define the Sobolev space $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$, which consists in all the tempered distributions u such that

$$\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} = \left(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^3}\left(1+|n|^2\right)^s|\hat{u}_n|^2\right)^{1/2}. \tag{1.3}$$

Since we shall consider always vector fields whose average is null the Sobolev norm defined above in particular is equivalent to the following semi-norm

$$\left\|(-\Delta)^{s/2}u\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \sim \|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \qquad s\in\mathbb{R},$$

which appears naturally in parabolic problems.
By the nature of the problem we will see that in what follows we will be forced to use anisotropic differential operators. In particular $\Delta_h = \partial_1^2+\partial_2^2$, as well as $\nabla_h = (\partial_1,\partial_2)^\intercal, \nabla_h^\perp = (-\partial_2,\partial_1)^\intercal$. Generally for any two-components vector field $u = \left(u^1,u^2\right)$ we shall denote as $u^\perp = \left(-u^2,u^1\right)$.
Let us define the operator $\mathbb{P}$ as the three dimensional Leray operator $\mathbb{P}^{(3)}$ wich leaves untouched the fourth component, i.e.

$$\mathbb{P} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \delta_{i,j}-\Delta^{-1}\partial_i\partial_j & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1\end{array}\right)_{i,j=1,2,3} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbb{P}^{(3)} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1\end{array}\right).$$

The operator $\mathbb{P}$ is a pseudo-differential operator, in the Fourier space his symbol is

$$\mathbb{P}_n = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \delta_{i,j}-\dfrac{\check{n}_i\,\check{n}_j}{|\check{n}|^2} & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 1\end{array}\right)_{i,j=1,2,3},$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ is Kronecker's delta and $\check{n}_i = n_i/a_i, |\check{n}|^2 = \sum_i \check{n}_i^2$.

1.2. **Anisotropic spaces.** The problem presents a singular perturbation $\mathcal{A}$ which does not acts symmetrically on the two-dimensional unit-sphere $\mathbb{S}^2$, namely there is a relevant external force acting along the vertical direction. This asymmetry in the balance of forces induces the solutions of (PBS_ε) to behave differently along the horizontal and vertical directions. For this reason we are forced to introduce anisotropic spaces, which means spaces which behaves differently in the horizontal or vertical direction. Let us recall that, in the periodic case, the non-homogeneous Sobolev anisotropic spaces are defined by the norm

$$\|u\|^2_{H^{s,s'}(\mathbb{T}^3)} = \sum_{n=(n_h,n_3)\in\mathbb{Z}^3}\left(1+|\check{n_h}|^2\right)^s\left(1+|\check{n_3}|^2\right)^{s'}|\hat{u}_n|^2,$$

where we denoted $\check{n}_i = n_i/a_i, n_h = (n_1,n_2)$ and the Fourier coefficients $\hat{u}_n$ are given by $u = \sum_n \hat{u}_n e^{2\pi i\check{n}\cdot x}$. In the whole text $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the Fourier transform. In particular our notation will be

$$\mathcal{F}u(n) = \hat{u}(n) = \hat{u}_n = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} u(x)e^{2\pi i\check{n}\cdot x}\mathrm{d}x.$$

Let's recall as well the definition of the anisotropic Lebesgue spaces, we denote with $L^p_hL^q_v$ the space $L^p\left(\mathbb{T}^2_h;L^q\left(\mathbb{T}^1_v\right)\right)$, defined by the norm:

$$\|f\|_{L^p_hL^q_v} = \left\|\|f(x_h,\cdot)\|_{L^q(\mathbb{T}^1_v)}\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^2_h)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^2_h}\left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^1_v}|f(x_h,x_3)|^q\,\mathrm{d}x_3\right)^{\frac{p}{q}}\mathrm{d}x_h\right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

in a similar way we demote the space $L_v^q L_h^p$. It is well-known that the order of integration is important as it is described in the following lemma

Lemma 1.1. *Let $1 \leqslant p \leqslant q$ and $f : X_1 \times X_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ a function belonging to $L^p(X_1; L^q(X_2))$ where $(X_1; \mu_1), (X_2; \mu_2)$ are measurable spaces, then $f \in L^q(X_2; L^p(X_1))$ and we have the inequality*

$$\|f\|_{L^q(X_2;L^p(X_1))} \leqslant \|f\|_{L^p(X_1;L^q(X_2))}.$$

In the anisotropic setting the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality becomes;

$$\|fg\|_{L_h^p L_v^q} \leqslant \|f\|_{L_h^{p'} L_v^{q'}} \|g\|_{L_h^{p''} L_v^{q''}},$$

where $1/p = 1/p' + 1/p'', 1/q = 1/q' + 1/q''$.

We shall need as well to define spaces which are of mixed Lebesgue-Sobolev type. Namely, we define the space

$$L_v^p(H_h^\sigma) = L^p\left(\mathbb{T}_v^1; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right)\right),\ p \in [1, \infty),$$

as the closure of the tempered distributions with respect to the norm

$$\|u\|_{L_v^p(H_h^\sigma)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}_v^1} \left|\sum_{n_h \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \left(1 + |n_h|^2\right)^\sigma |\mathcal{F}_h u(n_h, x_3)|^2\right|^{p/2}\right)^{1/p}.$$

We define the space $L_v^\infty(H_h^\sigma) = L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v^1; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right)\right)$ thanks to the norm

$$\|u\|_{L_v^\infty(H_h^\sigma)} = \sup_{x_3 \in \mathbb{T}_v^1} \|u(\cdot, x_3)\|_{H_h^\sigma}.$$

1.3. **Results.** We recall at first the celebrated Fujita-Kato theorem, i.e. a result of (local) well-posedness in Sobolev spaces for Navier-Stokes equations. The proof can be found in many texts, we refer to [18] and [19] or [16].

Theorem 1.2. *Let us consider the following system describing the evolution of an incompressible viscid fluid in the d-dimensional periodic space $\mathbb{T}^d$*

$$\text{(NS)} \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + (u \cdot \nabla) u - \nu \Delta u = -\nabla p, \\ \nabla \cdot u = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0, \end{cases}$$

and let $u_0 \in H^{\frac{d}{2}-1}\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)$, then there exists a positive time $T^\star$ such that (NS) *has a unique solution $u \in L^4\left([0, T^\star]; H^{\frac{d-1}{2}}\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right)$ which also belongs to*

$$\mathcal{C}\left([0, T^\star]; H^{\frac{d}{2}-1}\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right) \cap L^2\left([0, T^\star]; H^{\frac{d}{2}}\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right).$$

Let us denote $T_{u_0}^\star$ be the maximal time of definitions of solution of (NS) *with initial data u_0, then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that if*

$$\|u_0\|_{H^{\frac{d}{2}-1}} \leqslant c\nu \Longrightarrow T_{u_0}^\star = \infty.$$

Since the perturbation appearing in (PBS_ε) is skew symmetric we know that the bulk force $\mathcal{A}V^\varepsilon$ does not apport any energy in any $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ space, whence Theorem 1.2 can be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the system (PBS_ε), and in particular this is the formulation wich we shall use:

Theorem 1.3. *If $V_0^\varepsilon \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ with $s > 1/2$ there exists a positive time $T^\star$ independent of $\varepsilon > 0$ and a unique strong solution V^ε of (1.1) in the space $L^4\left([0,T^\star];H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ which also belongs to the space $\mathcal{C}\left([0,T^\star];H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)\cap L^2\left([0,T^\star];H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$. In particular if $\|V_0^\varepsilon\|_{H^{s+\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant c\nu$ for some positive and small constant c than the solution is global in $\mathbb{R}_+$.*

Th system (PBS_ε) has a limit when $\varepsilon \to 0$, the limit system may be written in the following form

$$(\mathcal{S}_0)\qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t U + \mathcal{Q}(U,U) - \mathbb{D}U = 0, \\ U|_{t=0} = V_0. \end{cases}$$

The sense in which system (PBS_ε) converges to ($\mathcal{S}_0$) shall be explained in detail in Section 2 and 3. Section 3 is entirely devoted to explain in detail in what consists the limit form $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathbb{D}$.
As it is proven in [20] any system in the generic form (1.1) converges to a limit system of the form ($\mathcal{S}_0$) in the sense of distributions. In the Section 6 we extend this convergence to a strong setting. Such technique has been introduced by S. Schochet in [28] and has been adapted to the parabolic setting by I. Gallagher in [20, Theorem 1]. The statement of [20, Theorem 1] is the following:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $U_0 \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)$ with $s \geqslant \frac{d}{2} - 1$, and let U solution of ($\mathcal{S}_0$) satisfy*

$$U \in \mathcal{C}\left([0,T^\star];H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right)\cap L^2\left([0,T^\star];H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right)$$

then, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough the associate solution V^ε of (1.1) is also defined on $[0,T^\star]$ and

$$V^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)U = o(1),$$

in $\mathcal{C}\left([0,T^\star];H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right)\cap L^2\left([0,T^\star];H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^d\right)\right)$.

The main result proved in the present paper is the following one:

Theorem 1.5. *Let us consider a vector field $V_0 = \left(v_0, V_0^4\right) = \left(V_0^1, V_0^2, V_0^3, V_0^4\right) \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$, $s > 1/2$. Let V_0 be of global zero average and of horizontal zero average, i.e.*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} V_0(y)\,\mathrm{d}y = 0, \qquad \int_{\mathbb{T}^2_h} V_0(y_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}y_h = 0. \tag{1.4}$$

From V_0 let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_0^h &= \mathrm{curl}_h V_0^h, & \bar{U}_0 &= \left(\nabla_h^\perp \Delta_h^{-1}\omega_0^h, 0, 0\right), & U_{\mathrm{osc},0} &= V_0 - \bar{U}_0. \\ &= -\partial_2 V_0^1 + \partial_1 V_0^2 & &= \left(\bar{u}_0^h, 0, 0\right), & & \end{aligned}$$

The limit system ($\mathcal{S}_0$) can be divided into two systems which describe the evolution of U onto $\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ and $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})^\perp$ respectively. If we assume $\bar{u}_0^h \in L_v^\infty(H_h^\sigma)$ and $\nabla_h \bar{u}_0^h \in L_v^\infty(H_h^\sigma)$ with $\sigma > 0$, then $\bar{u}^h$, which is the projection of U solution of ($\mathcal{S}_0$) onto $\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$, solves the system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^h + \bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}^h - \nu\Delta \bar{u}^h = -\nabla_h \bar{p} \\ \bar{u}^h\Big|_{t=0} = \bar{u}_0^h. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

Moreover $\bar{u}^h$ is globally well posed in $\mathbb{R}_+$, and belongs to the space

$$\bar{u}^h \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)\cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right)\right), \qquad s > 1/2,$$

and for each $t > 0$ the following estimate holds true

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \nu \int_0^t \left\|\nabla \bar{u}^h(\tau)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant \mathcal{E}_1(U_0).$$

Where the function $\mathcal{E}_1$ is defined as the right-hand-side of equation (5.2).
On the other hand, if we denote as U_{osc} as the projection of U solution of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ *onto* $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})^{\perp}$, *then, for almost all $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ parameters of the three-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^3 = \prod_i [0, 2\pi\, a_i]$, U_{osc} satisfies the following linear system*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U_{\mathrm{osc}} + 2\mathcal{Q}\left(\bar{U}, U_{\mathrm{osc}}\right) - \left(\nu + \nu'\right)\Delta U_{\mathrm{osc}} = 0, \\ U_{\mathrm{osc}}|_{t=0} = U_{\mathrm{osc},0} = V_0 - \bar{U}_0. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Moreover U_{osc} is globally defined and it belongs to the space

$$U_{\mathrm{osc}} \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right)\right),$$

for $s > 1/2$. For each $t > 0$ the following bound holds true

$$\|U_{\mathrm{osc}}(t)\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \frac{\nu + \nu'}{2} \int_0^t \|\nabla U_{\mathrm{osc}}(\tau)\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant \mathcal{E}_2(U_0),$$

and the function $\mathcal{E}_2$ is defined as the right-hand-side of equation (5.19). *Moreover since V_0 in $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ for $s > 1/2$ as above, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough* $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$ *is globally well posed in $\mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$, and, if U is the solution of* (1.6), *then*

$$V^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) U = o(1),$$

in $\mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$.

Let us outline the structure of the paper:

- In Section 2 we shall study the linear problem associated to the singular perturbation $\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ characterizing the system $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$. By mean of a careful spectral analysis of the penalized operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ we define what shall be called the *non-oscillating* and *oscillating* subspace. The first is the subspace in Fourier variables defined by the divergence-free elements belonging to the kernel of $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$. Being in the kernel of such operator the evolution of such elements shall not be influenced by the highly external force $\varepsilon^{-1}\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ and hence it shall not exhibit any oscillating behavior. On the other hand the element belonging to the oscillating subspace, which is the orthogonal complement of $\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ will present an oscillating behavior which depends (inversely) from the parameter ε.
- In Section 3 we apply the Poicaré semigroup

  $$\mathcal{L}(\tau) = e^{-\tau \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}},$$

  to the system $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$. The new variable $U^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right) V^\varepsilon$ satisfies an equation which is very close to the three-dimensional periodic Navier-Stokes equation (see $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$). Thanks to this similarity we can deduce that the weak solutions $\left(U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon$ are in fact uniformly bounded in some suitable space, and thanks to standard compactness arguments we deduce that

  $$U^\varepsilon \to U,$$

  weakly. In particular U satisfies a three-dimensional Navier-Stokes-like equation, whose bilinear interaction (defined in (3.4)) has better product rules than the standard transport-form. Lastly we deduce that V^ε can in fact be written as

  $$V^\varepsilon = \text{ stationary state } + \text{ high oscillation } + \text{ reminder.}$$

- in Section 4 we study the limit (in the sense of distributions) of the filtered system $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. In particular such limit has two qualitatively different behaviors once we consider its projection onto $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})$ and $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})^\perp$:
  - The projection of the limit system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})$ presents, as a bilinear interaction, bilinear interactions of elements of $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})$ only, and in particular it is represented by a two-dimensional, stratified, Navier-Stokes equation with additional vertical diffusion.
  - The projection of the limit system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})^\perp$ is, for almost all three-dimensional tori, a linear equation in the unknown U_{osc}. Such deduction is a result of a geometrical analysis on the domain, we denote the domains which satisfies such properties as *non-resonant domains*.
- The Section 5 is devoted to the study of the global-in-time well posedness for the limit system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ in some super-critical $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), s > 1/2$ spaces. As well as in Section 4 we divide the proof in two sub-parts, considering the projection of the solutions onto $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})$ and $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})^\perp$ respectively
  - The kernel part, as already stated, is a two-dimensional stratified Navier-Stokes equation. We take advantage of the fact that, along the vertical direction, the equation is purely diffusive without transport term. This allows us to prove that in fact, for some suitable anisotropic strong norms, the solution decay exponentially-in-time, and hence the global-in-time result.
  - For the oscillating subspace we exploit the fact that the solution satisfied by U_{osc} is linear to achieve the global result.
- Lastly, in Section 6, we use a smart change of variable, technique introduced by S. Schochet in [28], to prove that

$$V^\varepsilon - \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)U \to 0 \qquad \text{in } L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+, H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+, H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right)\right),\ s > 1/2.$$

1.4. **Elements of Littlewood-Paley theory.** A tool that will be widely used all along the paper is the theory of Littlewood–Paley, which consists in doing a dyadic cut-off of the frequencies.
Let us define the (non-homogeneous) truncation operators as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\triangle_q u &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{u}_n \varphi\left(\frac{|\check{n}|}{2^q}\right) e^{i\check{n}\cdot x}, && \text{for } q \geqslant 0,\\
\triangle_{-1} u &= \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^3} \hat{u}_n \chi\left(|\check{n}|\right) e^{i\check{n}\cdot x},\\
\triangle_q u &= 0, && \text{for } q \leqslant -2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $u \in \mathcal{D}'\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ and $\hat{u}_n$ are the Fourier coefficients of u. The functions φ and χ represent a partition of the unity in $\mathbb{R}$, which means that are smooth functions with compact support such that

$$\text{supp } \chi \subset B\left(0, \frac{4}{3}\right), \qquad \text{supp } \varphi \subset \mathcal{C}\left(\frac{3}{4}, \frac{8}{3}\right),$$

and such that for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\chi(t) + \sum_{q\geqslant 0} \varphi\left(2^{-q}t\right) = 1.$$

Let us define further the low frequencies cut-off operator

$$S_q u = \sum_{q'\leqslant q-1} \triangle_{q'} u.$$

1.4.1. *Anisotropic paradifferential calculus.* The dyadic decomposition turns out to be very useful also when it comes to study the product betwee two distributions. We can in fact, at least formally, write for two distributions u and v

$$u=\sum_{q\in\mathbb{Z}}\triangle_q u;\qquad v=\sum_{q'\in\mathbb{Z}}\triangle_{q'}v;\qquad u\cdot v=\sum_{\substack{q\in\mathbb{Z}\\ q'\in\mathbb{Z}}}\triangle_q u\cdot\triangle_{q'}v. \tag{1.7}$$

We are going to perform a Bony decomposition (see [4], [5], [12] for the isotropic case and [13], [23] for the anisotropic one).
Paradifferential calculus is a mathematical tool for splitting the above sum in three parts

- The first part concerns the indices (q,q') for which the size of supp $\mathcal{F}(\triangle_q u)$ is small compared to supp $\mathcal{F}\left(\triangle_{q'}v\right)$.
- The second part contains the indices corresponding to those frequencies of u which are large compared to those of v.
- In the last part supp $\mathcal{F}\left(\triangle_{q'}v\right)$ and supp $\mathcal{F}(\triangle_q u)$ have comparable sizes.

In particular we obtain

$$u\cdot v=T_u v+T_v u+R(u,v),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}T_u v&=\sum_q S_{q-1}u\ \triangle_q v,\\ T_v u&=\sum_{q'} S_{q'-1}v\ \triangle_{q'}u,\\ R(u,v)&=\sum_k\sum_{|\nu|\leqslant 1}\triangle_k u\ \triangle_{k+\nu}v.\end{aligned}$$

The following almost orthogonality properties hold

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle_q\left(S_{q'-1}a\triangle_{q'}b\right)&=0, &&\text{if } \left|q-q'\right|\geqslant 5,\\ \triangle_q\left(\triangle_{q'}a\triangle_{q'+\nu}b\right)&=0, &&\text{if } q'<q-4,\ |\nu|\leqslant 1,\end{aligned}$$

and hence we will often use the following relation

$$\begin{aligned}\triangle_q(u\cdot v)&=\sum_{|q-q'|\leqslant 4}\triangle_q\left(S_{q'-1}v\ \triangle_{q'}u\right)+\sum_{|q-q'|\leqslant 4}\triangle_q\left(S_{q'-1}u\ \triangle_{q'}v\right)+\sum_{q'\geqslant q-4}\sum_{|\nu|\leqslant 1}\triangle_q\left(\triangle_{q'}a\triangle_{q'+\nu}b\right),\\ &=\sum_{|q-q'|\leqslant 4}\triangle_q\left(S_{q'-1}v\ \triangle_{q'}u\right)+\sum_{q'>q-4}\triangle_q\left(S_{q'+2}u\triangle_{q'}v\right).\end{aligned} \tag{1.8}$$

In the paper [10] J.-Y. Chemin and N. Lerner introduced the following asymmetric decomposition, which will be first used by Chemin et al. in [13] in its anisotropic version. This particular decomposition turns out to be very useful in our context

$$\triangle_q(uv)=S_{q-1}u\ \triangle_q v+\sum_{|q-q'|\leqslant 4}\left\{\left[\triangle_q,S_{q'-1}u\right]\triangle_{q'}v+\left(S_q u-S_{q'-1}u\right)\triangle_q\triangle_{q'}v\right\}+\sum_{q'>q-4}\triangle_q\left(S_{q'+2}v\ \triangle_{q'}u\right), \tag{1.9}$$

where the commutator $[\triangle_q,a]\,b$ is defined as

$$[\triangle_q,a]\,b=\triangle_q(ab)-a\triangle_q b.$$

There is an interesting relatoin of regularity between dyadic blocks and full function in the Sobolev spaces, i.e.

$$\|\triangle_q f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\leqslant Cc_q 2^{-qs}\|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}, \tag{1.10}$$

with $\left\|\{c_q\}_{q\in\mathbb{Z}}\right\|_{\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})} \equiv 1$. In the same way we denote as b_q a sequence in $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $\sum_q |b_q| \leqslant 1$.

In particular in Section 5 we shall need paradifferential calculus in the horizontal variables, everything is the same as in the isotropic case except that we shall take the Fourier transform only on the horizontal components, i.e.

$$\mathcal{F}_h f(n_h, x_3) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^2_h} f(x_h, x_3)\, e^{-2\pi i x_h \cdot n_h} \mathrm{d}x_h,$$

and we can define hence the horizontal truncation operators (as well as the low frequencies cut off, reminders, etc...) $\triangle_q^h$ in the same way as we did for $\triangle_q$ except that we act only on the horizontal variables. This difference shall be denoted by the fact that that we will always put an index h when it comes to the horizontal anisotropic paradifferential calculus.

1.4.2. *Some basic estimates.* The interest in the use of the dyadic decomposition is that the derivative of a function localized in frequencies of size 2^q acts like the multiplication with the factor 2^q (up to a constant independent by q). In our setting (periodic case) a Bernstein type inequality holds. For a proof of the following lemma in the anisotropic (hence as well isotropic) setting we refer to the work [23]. For the sake of self-completeness we state the result in both isotropic and anisotropic setting.

Lemma 1.6. *Let u be a function such that $\mathcal{F}u$ is supported in $2^q\mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the Fourier transform. For all integers k the following relation holds*

$$2^{qk} C^{-k} \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant \left\|(-\Delta)^{k/2} u\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant 2^{qk} C^k \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)}.$$

Let now $r \geqslant r' \geqslant 1$ be real numbers. Let supp$\mathcal{F}u \subset 2^q B$, then

$$\|u\|_{L^r} \leqslant C \cdot 2^{3q\left(\frac{1}{r'}-\frac{1}{r}\right)} \|u\|_{L^{r'}}.$$

Let us consider now a function u such that $\mathcal{F}u$ is supported in $2^q\mathcal{C}_h \times 2^{q'}\mathcal{C}_v$. Let us define $D_h = (-\Delta_h)^{1/2}, D_3 = |\partial_3|$, then

$$C^{-q-q'} 2^{qs+q's'} \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant \left\|D_h^s D_3^{s'} u\right\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant C^{q+q'} 2^{qs+q's'} \|u\|_{L^p(\mathbb{T}^3)},$$

and given $1 \leqslant p' \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$, $1 \leqslant r' \leqslant r \leqslant \infty$, then

$$\|u\|_{L^p_h L^r_v} \leqslant C^{q+q'} 2^{2q\left(\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+q'\left(\frac{1}{r'}-\frac{1}{r}\right)} \|u\|_{L^{p'}_h L^{r'}_v},$$

$$\|u\|_{L^r_v L^p_h} \leqslant C^{q+q'} 2^{2q\left(\frac{1}{p'}-\frac{1}{p}\right)+q'\left(\frac{1}{r'}-\frac{1}{r}\right)} \|u\|_{L^{r'}_v L^{p'}_h}.$$

The following are inequalities of Gagliardo-Niremberg type, which combined with the anisotropic version of the Bernstein lemma will give us some information that we will use continuously all along the paper. We will avoid to give the proofs of such tools since they are already present in [25].

Lemma 1.7. *There exists a constant C such that for all periodic vector fields u on $\mathbb{T}^3$ with zero horizontal average ($\int_{\mathbb{T}^2_h} u(x_h, x_3)\, \mathrm{d}x_h = 0$) we have*

$$\|u\|_{L^2_v L^4_h} \leqslant C \cdot \|u\|^{1/2}_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \|\nabla_h u\|^{1/2}_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}. \tag{1.11}$$

Finally we state a lemma that shows that the commutator with the truncation operator is a regularizing operator.

Lemma 1.8. *Let $\mathbb{T}^3$ be a 3D torus and p, r, s real positive numbers such that $r', s', p, r, s \geqslant 1$ $\frac{1}{r'} + \frac{1}{s'} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s}$. There exists a constant C such that for all vector fields u and v on $\mathbb{T}^3$ we have the inequality*

$$\left\| [\triangle_q, u]\, v \right\|_{L_v^2 L_h^p} \leqslant C \cdot 2^{-q} \left\| \nabla u \right\|_{L_v^{r'} L_h^r} \left\| v \right\|_{L_v^{s'} L_h^s},$$

indeed there exists an isotropic counterpart of such Lemma (see [26], [29]).

2. The linear problem.

Let us introduce at first some notation. Let us consider the generic linear problem associated with the linear operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau W + \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}\, W = 0, \\ \text{div}\ \ w = 0, \\ W = \left(w, W^4\right), \\ W|_{\tau=0} = W_0. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

$\mathcal{A}$ is he skew symmetric penalized matrix defined in (1.2). $\mathbb{P}$ is the Leray projection onto the divergence free vector fields, without changing V^4. In the Fourier space $\mathbb{P}$ has the following form

$$\mathbb{P}_n = 1_{\mathbb{C}^4} - \frac{1}{|\check{n}|^2} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n_1^2}{a_1^2} & \frac{n_1 n_2}{a_1 a_2} & \frac{n_1 n_3}{a_1 a_3} & 0 \\ \frac{n_2 n_1}{a_2 a_1} & \frac{n_2^2}{a_2^2} & \frac{n_2 n_3}{a_2 a_3} & 0 \\ \frac{n_3 n_1}{a_3 a_1} & \frac{n_3 n_2}{a_3 a_2} & \frac{n_2^3}{a_2^3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $|\check{n}|^2 = \sum_j \frac{n_j^2}{a_j^2}$ and $1_{\mathbb{C}^4}$ is the identity matrix on $\mathbb{C}^4$. From now on we shall drop the check notation on the Fourier nodes $n \in \mathbb{Z}^3$.

To the sake of completeness we give here the action of the matrix $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ in the Fourier space, which is

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}\, u\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{n_1 n_2}{|n|^2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{n_2 n_3}{|n|^2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 - \frac{n_3^2}{|n|^2} \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \hat{u}_n.$$

Such kind of equation has been thoroughly first studied by Poincaré in [27]. The study of the linear equation (2.1) is essential in the study of the nonlinear problem (PBS_ε). The solution of (2.1) is obviously

$$W(\tau) = e^{-\tau \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}} W_0 = \mathcal{L}(-\tau)\, W_0. \tag{2.3}$$

We want to give an explicit sense to the propagator $e^{-\tau \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}$. To do so we perform a spectral analysis of the operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$. After some calculations we obtain that the matrix $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ admits an eigenvalue $\omega^0(n) \equiv 0$ with multiplicity 2 and other two eigenvalues

$$\omega^{\pm}(n) = \pm i \frac{|n_h|}{|n|} = \pm i \omega(n). \tag{2.4}$$

The matrix $\left(\widehat{\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}\right)_n$ admits a basis of normal (in the sense that they have norm one) eigenvectors. In particular the basis is the following one

$$\tilde{e}_1^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \tilde{e}_2^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad e^{\pm}(n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \pm i \frac{n_1 n_3}{|n_h||n|} \\ \pm i \frac{n_2 n_3}{|n_h||n|} \\ \mp i \frac{|n_h|}{|n|} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We imposed that the solutions of (2.1) are divergence-free, in the sense that they are orthogonal, in the Fourier space, to the vector $(n_1, n_2, n_3, 0)$. Now, not all the subspace $\mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_1^0 \oplus \mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_2^0$, which is the kernel of the operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$, satisfies this property. In any case there exist a subspace of $\mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_1^0 \oplus \mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_2^0$ which is divergence free. This space is the space generated by

$$e^0(n) = \frac{1}{|n_h|} \begin{pmatrix} -n_2 \\ n_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we underline again that $\mathbb{C}e^0 \subset \mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_1^0 \oplus \mathbb{C}\tilde{e}_2^0$.
We have hence identified a basis of divergence-free, orthogonal eigenvectors associated to the linear problem (2.1), which is

$$e^0(n) = \frac{1}{|n_h|} \begin{pmatrix} -n_2 \\ n_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad e^{\pm}(n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \pm i \frac{n_1 n_3}{|n_h||n|} \\ \pm i \frac{n_2 n_3}{|n_h||n|} \\ \mp i \frac{|n_h|}{|n|} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.5}$$

A case of particular interest which shall be crucial in Section 4 is the subspace $\{n_h = 0\}$ of the frequency space. Performing the required computation we prove that the only eigenvalue is $\omega(n) \equiv 0$ with multiplicity four. The Fourier multiplier $\left(\widehat{\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}\right)(n)$ associated to $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ is

$$\left(\widehat{\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}\right)(0, n_3) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which admits three eigenvalues related to ω:

$$\tilde{e}_1^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{e}_2^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{e}_3^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.6}$$

We underline the fact that $\tilde{e}_i^0, i = 1, 2, 3$ are divergence-free on the restriction $\{n_h = 0\}$ of the Fourier space. We remark the fact that the hypothesis (1.4) automatically excludes the case which the initial data V_0 is a function depending on x_3 only. In fact

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} V_0(x_3)\, \mathrm{d}y_h \Longrightarrow V(x_3) = 0 \text{ for each } x_3 \in \mathbb{T}_v^1.$$

This case is hence *not considered* in the present work.

The eigenvectors in (2.5) are orthogonal with respect the standard $\mathbb{C}^4$ scalar product, whence the generic solution given in (2.3) can be expressed in the following form

$$W = \bar{W} + W_{\text{osc}}.$$

We denoted as $\bar{W}$ the orthogonal projection of W onto the space $\mathbb{C}e^0$, i.e. onto the divergence-free part of the kernel. This projection takes the form (in the Fourier variables)

$$\mathcal{F}\,\bar{W}\,(n) = \left(\mathcal{F}\,W\,(n)|\,e^0\,(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\;e^0\,(n)\,.$$

In the same way W_{osc} is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}\,W_{\text{osc}}\,(n) = \left(\mathcal{F}\,W\,(n)|\,e^+\,(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\;e^+\,(n) + \left(\mathcal{F}\,W\,(n)|\,e^-\,(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\;e^-\,(n)\,,$$

i.e. the decomposition of the (Fourier) data along the directions of $e^+,\ e^-$.

We shall denote these two parts of the solution respectively as the *oscillating* and the *non-oscillating* part of the solution. This choice of the names has an easy mathematical justification. Let us in fact consider $\bar{W}_0$ and let us consider the evolution imposed by the laws of the system (2.1) on such vector field. By mean of the explicit solution given in (2.3) we obtain (recall that $\bar{W}$ belongs to ker $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$)

$$\bar{W}\,(t) = \bar{W}_0.$$

Hence the non-oscillating part of the solution $\bar{W}$ is in fact a stationary (in the sense that is not time-dependent) flow. This is reasonable since once we consider the linear system (2) restricted on ker $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ there is no external force at all acting on it.
On the other hand along the direction of (say) e^+ the evolution at time τ of the solution has direction (in the Fourier space)

$$\left(e^{-\tau\left(\widehat{\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}\right)_n}\right)\;e^+\,(n) = e^{-i\,\tau\,\omega(n)}\;e^+\,(n)\,,$$

hence it spins with a angular speed $\omega = \omega\,(n) = \dfrac{|n_h|}{|n|}$.
Introducing hence a small parameter ε we act, on a physical point of view, on the system in very well-defined way: the spinning linear force grows and with it the turbulent behavior of the solution.

Indeed as long as we consider a generic time-dependent nonlinearity the problem does not behave in such a rigid and well-defined way. Let us consider hence a nonlinear problem associated to (2.1)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau W_N + \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}\,W_N = \mathcal{N}\,(\tau)\,, \\ \text{div}\;\; w_N = 0, \\ W = \left(w_N, W_N^4\right), \\ W_N|_{\tau=0} = W_{N,0}. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

The nonlinearity $\mathcal{N}\,(\tau)$ is very generic and only time-dependent, but this is not restrictive, since we want to give a qualitative analysis of the behaviour of the solutions.
By mean of Duhamel formula the solution is expressed as

$$W_N\,(\tau) = e^{-\tau\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}W_{N,0} + \int_0^\tau e^{-(\tau-\sigma)\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{N}\,(\sigma)\,\mathrm{d}\sigma.$$

This generic formulation does not says much, but we can still extract interesting information. Let us denote $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ the projection of $\mathcal{N}$ onto the nonoscillatory space, i.e.

$$\mathcal{F}\,\bar{\mathcal{N}} = \left(\mathcal{F}\,\mathcal{N}|\,e^0\right)\;e^0.$$

The projection of W_N onto the nonoscillatory space shall hence be described by the law

$$\bar{W}_N(\tau) = \bar{W}_{N,0} + \int_0^t \bar{\mathcal{N}}(\sigma)\,\mathrm{d}\sigma.$$

The influence of the propagator (spinning behaviour) is not any more a direct consequence of the application of Duhamel formula, but it can still be present as long as $\bar{\mathcal{N}}$ is depending on the spinning eigenvectors $e^{\pm}$. We shall see that this will be a major problem in the comprehension of the limiting process as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

3. The filtered limit.

Our strategy shall be to "filter out" the system (PBS_ε) by mean of the propagator $\mathcal{L}$ defined above. Such technique is classic in singular problems on the torus ([20], [21], [25], [29]). Let us apply from the left the operator $\mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{P}$ where $\mathbb{P}$ is defined in (2.2) to the equation (PBS_ε). Setting $U^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{P}V^\varepsilon$ we obtain that the vector field U^ε satisfies the following evolution equation

$$(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t U^\varepsilon + \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon) - \mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon = 0, \\ \operatorname{div} v^\varepsilon = 0, \\ U^\varepsilon\big|_{t=0} = V_0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(A,B) =& \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{P}\left[\mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)A\cdot\nabla\mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)B + \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)B\cdot\nabla\mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)A\right], \\ \mathbb{D}^\varepsilon A =& \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{D}\mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)A. \end{aligned}$$

It is interesting to notice that the application of the Poincaré semigroup $\mathcal{L}$ allowed us to transform a problem with singular bulk force (PBS_ε) into a problem, ($\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon$), which does not presents any more such difficulty.

To understand the limit of the system (PBS_ε) means to diagonalize the system (PBS_ε) in terms of the oscillating and non-oscillating nodes introduced in Section 2. To do so we introduce the following quantities

$$(3.1) \qquad \begin{aligned} \omega^{h,\varepsilon} =& -\partial_2 u^{1,\varepsilon} + \partial_1 u^{2,\varepsilon}; & \bar{u}^{h,\varepsilon} =& \nabla_h^\perp \Delta_h^{-1}\omega^{h,\varepsilon}; \\ \psi^\varepsilon =& \Delta_h^{-1}\omega^{h,\varepsilon}; & \tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon =& \Delta_h^{-1/2}\omega^{h,\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

It might be interesting to notice the following properties:

- the quantity $\omega^{h,\varepsilon}$ defined in (3.1) is defined via a differential operator (curl_h). Reading this operator in term of Fourier variables gives in particular

  $$\omega^{h,\varepsilon} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}U^\varepsilon \middle|\, |n_h|\, e^0\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\right),$$

  so, geometrically, the application $U^\varepsilon \mapsto \omega^{h,\varepsilon}$ is nothing but the evaluation of the magnitude of the projection of U^ε onto the non-oscillating space e^0, modulated by a factor $|n_h|$. We shall hence have the possibility of think to projections onto the non-oscillatory space in two, different, equivalent ways.
- the projection of U^ε onto the non-oscillatory space generated by e^0 defined in (2.5) is exactly $\left(\hat{U}^\varepsilon \middle| e^0\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^0 = \mathcal{F}\tilde{\psi}^\varepsilon\, e^0$.
- The map $U^\varepsilon \mapsto \bar{u}^{h,\varepsilon}$ is defined by a pseudo-differential operator of order zero, hence all a priori $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ estimates that we can perform on equation ($\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon$) are valid on $\bar{u}^{h,\varepsilon}$ as well.

3.1. **Uniform bounds.** Let us state a first (weak) convergence result

Lemma 3.1. *Let $U^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{P}V^\varepsilon$, where V^ε is a strong solution of* $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$ *given by the theorem* (1.3)*. Let t initial data V_0 be bounded in $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$. The sequence $\left(U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon$ is compact in the space $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ and converges (up to subsequence) to an element U which belongs to the space*

$$L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^1\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

and the following uniform bound holds

$$\left\|U^\varepsilon(t)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} + 2\nu\int_0^t \left\|\nabla U^\varepsilon(\tau)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant \left\|V_0\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Since the filtered system does not present any more the singular perturbation a standard $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ estimate on the equation $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ shows that

$$\left\|U^\varepsilon(t)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} + 2\nu\int_0^t \left\|\nabla U^\varepsilon(\tau)\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant \left\|V_0\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}.$$

By the structure of the equation $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ it can be easily deduced that $\left(\partial_t U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{-N}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ in terms of the $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ norm of the initial data V_0^ε for N sufficiently large. Hence since $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ is compactly embedded in $H^{-N}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ and that $H^1\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ is continuously embedded in $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ it is sufficient to apply Aubin-Lions lemma [1] to deduce the claim. □

Let us introduce at first some notation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega^h &= \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}\,U(n)\middle|\,|n_h|\,e^0(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\right),\\
\bar{U} &= \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}\,U(n)\middle|\,e^0(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ e^0(n)\right) = \left(\bar{u}^h, 0, 0\right),\\
U_{\mathrm{osc}} &= \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}\,U(n)\middle|\,e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ e^+(n) + \left(\mathcal{F}\,U(n)\middle|\,e^-(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ e^-(n)\right),\\
U^a(n) &= \left(\mathcal{F}\,U(n)\middle|\,e^a(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ e^a(n), \qquad a\in\{0,\pm\},\\
\hat{U}^a(n) &= \left(\mathcal{F}\,U(n)\middle|\,e^a(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}, \qquad a\in\{0,\pm\},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and finally $U^{a,j}$ shall denote the j-th component of the vector U^a.
This kind of decomposition of the data accordingly to the (divergence-free) eigenvectors of the matrix $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ has already been introduced (and formally justified) in Section 2.

The convergence of U^ε to the element U does not give any qualitative information of the (eventual) solution which is satisfied by U. Especially the bilinear limit involving $\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon\left(U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon\right)$ is a priori not well-defined. By mean of stationary phase theorem we prove the following lemma

Lemma 3.2. *Let U^ε be a (local, strong) solution of $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ and let U be the limit of the sequence $\left(U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon$ identified in Lemma 3.1. Then the following limit hold (in the sense of distributions)*

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon\left(U^\varepsilon, U^\varepsilon\right) &= \mathcal{Q}\left(U, U\right),\\
\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon\, U^\varepsilon &= \mathbb{D}\, U,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathbb{D}$ has the following form

$$\mathcal{F}\,\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right) = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}=0\\ k+m=n\\ a,b,c\in\{0,\pm\}}} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1,2,3} U^{a,j}(k)\, m_j\right) U^b(m)\middle| e^c(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^c(n) \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathcal{F}\,\mathbb{D}\,U = \sum_{\omega^{a,b}_n=0}\left(\mathbb{D}(n)\,U^a(n)\middle|\,e^b(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n), \tag{3.5}$$

where $\omega_{k,m,n}^{a,b,c} = \omega^a(k) + \omega^b(m) - \omega^c(n)$ *and* $\omega_n^{a,b} = \omega^a(n) - \omega^b(n)$*, the Fourier multiplier* $\mathbb{D}(n)$ *in noting but the Fourier multiplier associated to the matrix* $\mathbb{D}$ *defined in* (1.2) *and the eigenvalues* ω^i *are defined in* (2.4)*.*

Proof. We start proving (3.5) since it is easier. By definition itself of $\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon$ we deduce that

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon\right)(n) = \sum_{a,b=0,\pm} e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n) U^{a,\varepsilon}(n) \left| e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n).$$

Hence all we have to prove is that

$$\sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n) U^{a,\varepsilon}(n) \left| e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n) \to 0,$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$ in the sense of distributions. To do so we consider $\phi \in \mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3\right)$. Since for $s, t < 3/2$, $s + t > 0$ the map

$$\begin{aligned} H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right) \times H^t\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right) &\to H^{s+t-\frac{3}{2}}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), \\ (u, v) &\mapsto u \otimes v, \end{aligned}$$

is continuous we deduce that

$$\left(\partial_t U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon \quad \text{uniformly bounded in } L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{-3/2}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

We want hence to prove that

$$S_1 = \sum_n \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n) U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n) \left| e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n) \hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t \xrightarrow{\varepsilon\to 0} 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Indeed the sum on the left-hand-side of (3.6) is well defined (in the sense that the sum is smaller than infinity). We can decompose it as

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= S_{1,N} + S_1^N, \\ S_{1,N} &= \sum_{|n|\leqslant N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n) U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n) \left| e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n) \hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t, \\ S_1^N &= \sum_{|n|> N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n) U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n) \left| e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n) \hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

The term S_1^N is indeed an $o_N(1)$ function, considering in fact that the symbol $\mathbb{D}(n)$ can be bounded as $|\mathbb{D}(n)| \leqslant C|n|^2$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^N &\leqslant \frac{1}{N} \sum_{|n|>N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \int |\mathbb{D}(n) U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)|\,|n| \left|\hat{\phi}(t,n)\right| \mathrm{d}t, \\ &\leqslant \frac{C}{N} \sum_{|n|>N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \int |n|\,|\,U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)|\,|n|^2 \left|\hat{\phi}(t,n)\right| \mathrm{d}t \\ &\leqslant \frac{C}{N} \left\|U^\varepsilon\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^1)} \left\|\phi\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

which indeed tends to zero as $N \to \infty$ thanks to the uniform bound (3.2).
For the term $S_{1,N}$ We exploit the fact that

$$e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}} = -\frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega_n^{a,b}}\,\partial_t\left(e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega_n^{a,b}}\right), \tag{3.7}$$

and the fact that $\left|\omega_n^{a,b}\right| \geqslant c = c_N > 0$ in the set $|n| \leqslant N$. Using (3.7) on $S_{1,N}$ and integrating by parts we obtain that

$$S_{1,N} = \sum_{|n|\leqslant N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega_n^{a,b}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n)\,\partial_t U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)\left|e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t$$
$$+ \sum_{|n|\leqslant N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega_n^{a,b}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n)\,U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)\left|e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n)\,\partial_t\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

It is obvious that the term

$$\sum_{|n|\leqslant N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega_n^{a,b}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n)\,U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)\left|e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n)\,\partial_t\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t \xrightarrow{\varepsilon\to 0} 0,$$

hence we shall focus on the other one. Since $\left|\omega_n^{a,b}\right| \geqslant c = c_N > 0$, on the set $|n| \leqslant N$ and $\left|e^b\right| \equiv 1$ and the fact that the symbol $|\mathbb{D}(n)| \leqslant C\,|n|^2$ we can deduce

$$\left|\sum_{|n|\leqslant N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega_n^{a,b}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega_n^{a,b}} \left(\mathbb{D}(n)\,\partial_t U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)\left|e^b(n)\right.\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^b(n)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t\right|$$
$$\lesssim \sum_{|n|\leqslant N} \sum_{\omega_n^{a,b}\neq 0} \varepsilon \left|\int \partial_t U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,n)\,|n|^2\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t\right|$$
$$\leqslant C\,\varepsilon\,\|\partial_t U^\varepsilon\|_{L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-3/2}\right)}\,\|\phi\|_{L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{7/2}\right)} \to 0.$$

This concludes the proof of (3.5).

The proof of (3.4) is more delicate.
At first: if we consider the equation of the filtered system $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ is easy to deduce that

$$\left(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon,U^\varepsilon)\right)_\varepsilon \text{ bounded in } L^4\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-1/2}\right)\cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-3/2}\right),$$
$$\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon \text{ bounded in } L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-1}\right),$$

uniformly in ε. From this we deduce that

$$\left(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon,U^\varepsilon)\right)_\varepsilon \text{ bounded in } L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-1/2}\right)\cap L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-3/2}\right),$$

since $L^4_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+)\hookrightarrow L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+)$. Hence by interpolation in Sobolev spaces

$$\left(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon,U^\varepsilon)\right)_\varepsilon \text{ bounded in } L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-1}\right),$$

uniformly in ε.
This implies hence that

$$\left(\partial_t U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon = \left(-\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon(U^\varepsilon,U^\varepsilon)+\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon\right)_\varepsilon \text{ bounded in } L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-1}\right),$$

uniformly in ε.
We can finally focus on the proof of (3.4). To prove (3.4) is equivalent, thanks to the orthogonality of the eigenvectors e^i defined in (2.5), to prove that, for each $\phi\in\mathcal{D}\left(\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{T}^3\right)$

$$S_2 = \sum_n \sum_{\substack{\omega_{k,m,n}^{a,b,c}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega_{k,m,n}^{a,b,c}} U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t \to 0,$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$.
As it has been done above for the term S_1 we can decompose S_2 into

$$S_{2,N} = \sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t$$

$$S_2^N = S_2 - S_{2,N}.$$

The term $S_2^N \to 0$ as $N\to\infty$ as for the term S_1^N above. Using the fact that

$$e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} = -\frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}}\,\partial_t\left(e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}}\right),$$

and the fact that $\left|\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\right| \geqslant c = c_N > 0$ uniformly in k,m,n in the frequency set $\{|n|,|k|\leqslant N\}$ to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{2,N} = &\sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \partial_t U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &+ \sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes \partial_t U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t\\ &+ \sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\partial_t\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

Is obvious that the term

$$\sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\partial_t\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t \to 0,$$

while for the first two term on the right-hand-side of the equation above the procedure is the same, hence we focus on the first one only. It is indeed true that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} \frac{i\,\varepsilon}{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \int e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\,\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \partial_t U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)\otimes U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\,\mathrm{d}t\right|\\ &\qquad\leqslant \sum_{\substack{|n|\leqslant N\\ |k|\leqslant N}} \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}\neq 0\\ a,b,c=0,\pm,\\ n=k+m}} C\,\varepsilon \int |\partial_t U^{a,\varepsilon}(t,k)|\left|U^{b,\varepsilon}(t,m)\,\hat{\phi}(t,n)\right|\mathrm{d}t\\ &\qquad\leqslant C\,\varepsilon\,\|\partial_t U^{\varepsilon}\|_{L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{-1})}\,\|U^{\varepsilon}\phi\|_{L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_+;H^1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which tends uniformly w.r.t. ε to zero thanks to the uniform bounds given above, concluding the proof. □

It is hence interesting to notice that in this particular case a product of weakly converging sequences is convergent. At this point hence we have formally proved that

Lemma 3.3. *The sequence of (local, strong) solutions* $(U^\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ *of* $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ *converge in* $L^2_{\text{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ *to an element*

$$U \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^1\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

moreover U *is a solution (in the sense of distributions) of the equation*

$$(\mathcal{S}_0) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_U + \mathcal{Q}(U,U) - \mathbb{D}\,U = 0, \\ U|_{t=0} = V_0, \end{cases}$$

where respectively $\mathcal{Q}$ *and* $\mathbb{D}$ *are defined in* (3.4), (3.5).

This result of convergence is *di per se* interesting, but until this moment the system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ presents the same difficulties of the generic Navier-Stokes periodic equation as far as concerns the large time propagation of strong solutions with no particular assumption on the smallness of the initial data.

3.2. **Oscillating behavior of V^ε.** The above uniform bounds give a shady determination of the limit function U^ε. By definition of $U^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{P}V^\varepsilon$ with V^ε local strong solution of (PBS_ε) we want to determinate some qualitative connection between the oscillating behavior of the filtered system $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$ and the initial system (PBS_ε).

Thanks to Lemma 3.1 we can say that

$$U^\varepsilon(t,x) = U(t,x) + r^\varepsilon(t,x),$$

where

$$r^\varepsilon \to 0, \qquad \text{in } L^2_{\text{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

Hence r^ε is a perturbative term in the $L^2_{\text{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ topology. As it has been explained in detail in Section 2 we can decompose the (weak) limit U projecting it onto the non-oscillating and oscillating space

$$U = \bar{U} + U_{\text{osc}},$$

where the orthogonal projection is defined in (3.3). Since $U^\varepsilon = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\mathbb{P}V^\varepsilon$ we can hence deduce

$$V^\varepsilon(t,x) = \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\bar{U}(t,x) + \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)U_{\text{osc}}(t,x) + \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)r^\varepsilon(t,x).$$

By the definition itself of $\bar{U}$ we know that $\bar{U}$ belongs to the kernel of the penalized operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$, hence

$$\mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)\bar{U} = \bar{U}.$$

Moreover the operator $\mathcal{L}(\tau), \tau \in \mathbb{R}$ is unitary in $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$, whence the function

$$R^\varepsilon(t) = \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)r^\varepsilon(t),$$

is still an $o_\varepsilon(1)$ function in the $L^2_{\text{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ topology. Hence

$$V^\varepsilon(t,x) = \bar{U}(t,x) + \mathcal{L}\left(-\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)U_{\text{osc}}(t,x) + R^\varepsilon(t,x),$$

i.e. V^ε is a (high) oscillation around a stationary state $\bar{U}$ modulated by a $L^2_{\text{loc}}\left(\mathbb{R}_+, L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ perturbation which tends to zero as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

4. The limit.

The aim of this section is to give a full description of the limit system written in the generic form $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ in the case in which the penalized system is given by (PBS_ε).

In the present work we aim to prove large time propagation of strong solutions with no particular assumption on the smallness of the initial data for the system (PBS_ε). To achieve this goal we shall divide the limit system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ in two parts, the first one represents the evolution of U onto the kernel of the penalized operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$. Such projection is defined by the element $\bar{U}$ in (3.3). The second part will represent the projection of U onto the space $(\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A})^\perp$, this projection is denoted by the element U_{osc} defined in (3.3).

The main result we want to prove is the following one

Proposition 4.1. *Let V_0 be the initial data of the limit system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$. Let $V_0 \in L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$, let us define*

$$\omega_0^h = -\partial_2 V_0^1 + \partial_1 V_0^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_0 &= \left(\bar{u}_0^h, 0, 0\right), \\ &= \left(\nabla_h^\perp \Delta_h^{-1} \omega_0^h, 0, 0\right), \end{aligned} \qquad U_{\text{osc},0} = V_0 - \bar{U}_0.$$

The limit equation for the system $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$, i.e. the system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$, can be separated in two equations which describe the evolution of elements belonging to the kernel of $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ and those belonging to its orthogonal complement. The first one is

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^h + \bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}^h - \nu \Delta \bar{u}^h = -\nabla_h \bar{p}, \\ \bar{u}^h\Big|_{t=0} = \bar{u}_0^h. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

The second equation is linear in U_{osc} as in (3.3) and for almost all $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ it writes as

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U_{\text{osc}} + 2\mathcal{Q}\left(\bar{U}, U_{\text{osc}}\right) - \left(\nu + \nu'\right) \Delta U_{\text{osc}} = 0, \\ U_{\text{osc}}|_{t=0} = U_{\text{osc},0}. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Both $\bar{u}^h$ and U_{osc} solve (4.1) and (4.2) in the sense of distributions.

To prove Proposition 4.1 we proceed as follows: we consider separately the evolution of U distributional solution of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto the non-oscillating and oscillating subspace and prove that respectively $\bar{U}$ solves (4.1) and U_{osc} solves (4.2). These results are codified respectively in Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.6.
The structure of the following two subsections is very similar, namely we shall proceed in the following manner

- We project the equation $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto the non-oscillatory or oscillatory subspace.
- We study the bilinear interaction $\mathcal{Q}(U, U)$ once it is projected onto these spaces. We deduce that, under some suitable assumptions, such bilinear interaction once it is restricted on the subspaces mentioned above assumes a "suitable" form. We refer to the statements of Proposition 4.2 and 4.6 for further details of what "suitable" means.
- We study the form of the second-order linear elliptic operator $\mathbb{D}$ defined in (1.2) once it is projected on the non-oscillatory or oscillatory subspace.

4.1. **Derivation of the equation for $\bar{U}$.** The procedure we adopt to derive the limit system is pretty straightforward, we mention the works [20] and [25] where the authors adopted the same techniques.
As we already mentioned in this section we want to deduce the equations satisfied by the projection of U onto the non-oscillating space $\mathbb{C}e^0$. Such projection will be denoted as $\bar{U} = \left(\bar{u}^h, 0, 0\right)$ as it is already mentioned in (3.3). The result we want to prove is codified in the following proposition

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\bar{U}_0 = \left(\bar{u}_0^h, 0, 0\right) = \left(\nabla_h^{\perp}\Delta_h^{-1}\omega^h, 0, 0\right)$ be in $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$. The projection of U distributional solution of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto the non-oscillating space $\mathbb{C}e^0$ (see (2.4)) defined as*

$$\bar{U} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}U|\, e^0\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^0\right),$$

satisfies the following two-dimensional stratified Navier-Stokes equations with vertical diffusion (in the sense of distributions)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^h + \bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}^h - \nu\Delta\bar{u}^h = -\nabla_h \bar{p}, \\ \bar{u}^h\Big|_{t=0} = \bar{u}_0^h. \end{cases}$$

We divide the proof in steps:

Step 1 We project the equation $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto the non-oscillatory space generated by the vector e^0 defined in (2.5). We recall again that such projection is defined as follows (see (3.3) as well): given a vector field W the orthogonal projection is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}\,\bar{W} = \left(\hat{W}\Big|\, e^0\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\, e^0,$$

with this projection we can derive the evolution equation for the limit flow $\bar{U}$, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{U} + \overline{\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)} - \overline{\mathbb{D}\,U} = 0, \\ \bar{U}_0\big|_{t=0} = \bar{U}_0 = \bar{V}_0, \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Step 2 We prove by mean of a careful analysis that the projection of $\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)$ onto the non-oscillating subspace $\mathbb{C}e^0$, i.e. the element $\overline{\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)}$ is in fact

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)} = \mathcal{B}\left(\bar{U},\bar{U}\right),$$

for a suitable bilinear form $\mathcal{B}$. Hence the projection onto the kernel of the penalized operator $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$ of all the bilinear interactions is a suitable bilinear interaction of elements of the kernel.

Step 3 The last step of this section is to prove that

$$-\overline{\mathbb{D}\,U} = -\,\nu\Delta\bar{U}$$

We have explained the structure of the present session.

To prove Proposition 4.1 it is sufficient to prove Step 1 – Step 4 mentioned above.
Step 1 is only a constructive consideration, hence there is nothing to prove.

4.1.1. *Proof of Step 2.* The proof of the Step 2 is codified in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.3. *The limit of $\left(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(U^{\varepsilon},U^{\varepsilon}\right)|\, e^0\left(n\right)\right)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ is $\mathcal{F}\left(\Delta_h^{-1/2}\left(\bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \omega^h\right)\right)$, in the sense of distributions.*

Proof. Let us recall what is the explicit expression of $\mathcal{F}\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(U^{\varepsilon},U^{\varepsilon}\right)$,

$$\mathcal{F}\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(U^{\varepsilon},U^{\varepsilon}\right)\left(n\right) = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{a,b,c\in\{0,\pm\} \\ k+m=n}} e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}} \left(\sum_{j=1,2,3} U^{a,\varepsilon,j}\left(k\right) m_j U^{b,\varepsilon}\left(m\right)\Big|\, e^c\left(n\right)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^c\left(n\right), \tag{4.4}$$

where $\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n} = \omega^a(k) + \omega^b(m) - \omega^c(n)$ and $U^a(n) = (\mathcal{F}U(n)|\, e^a(n))_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ e^a(n)$ and $U^{a,j}$ is the j-th component of the vector U^a.
As explained before in Lemma 3.2 thanks to the stationary phase theorem ([30]) in the limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ the only contributions remaining in (4.4) is

$$\mathcal{FQ}(U,U)(n) = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}=0 \\ k+m=n \\ j=1,2,3}} \left(U^{a,j}(k)\, m_j U^b(m) \middle| e^c(n) \right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ e^c(n)\,. \tag{4.5}$$

Now, since e^0 is orthogonal to $e^{\pm}$ as is evident from the definition of the eigenvectors given in (2.5) we obtain that, projecting on the non-oscillatory subspace $\left(\mathcal{FQ}(U,U)|\, e^0\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}$

$$\left(\mathcal{FQ}(U,U)(n)|\, e^0(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,0}_{k,m,n}=0 \\ k+m=n \\ j=1,2,3}} \left(U^{a,j}(k)\, m_j U^b(m) \middle| e^0(n) \right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ \left|e^0(n)\right|^2,$$

whence we can reduce ourselves in the case $c = 0$.

Reading in the Fourier space the projection of the bilinear form it is clear that not all Fourier nodes contribute to the bilinear interaction. In the special case that we are considering now in fact the set of bilinear interactions is

$$\left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \omega^{a,b,0}_{k,m,n} = 0, a, b = 0, \pm,\ k+m=n\right\} = \mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{3} \mathcal{R}_i,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}_0 &= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \omega^{0,0,0}_{k,m,n} = 0, k+m=n\right\},\\
\mathcal{R}_1 &= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \omega^{\pm,\pm,0}_{k,m,n} = 0, k+m=n\right\},\\
&= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \pm\frac{|k_h|}{|k|} \pm \frac{|m_h|}{|m|} = 0, k+m=n\right\},\\
\mathcal{R}_2 &= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \left(\omega^{\pm,0,0}_{k,m,n} = 0\right) \vee \left(\omega^{0,\pm,0}_{k,m,n} = 0\right), k+m=n\right\},\\
&= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \left(\pm\frac{|k_h|}{|k|} = 0\right) \vee \left(\pm\frac{|m_h|}{|m|} = 0\right), k+m=n\right\},\\
\mathcal{R}_3 &= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \omega^{\pm,\mp,0}_{k,m,n} = 0, k+m=n\right\},\\
&= \left\{(k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \pm\frac{|k_h|}{|k|} \mp \frac{|m_h|}{|m|} = 0, k+m=n\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

The decomposition $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{3} \mathcal{R}_i$ is made only in order to have a more readable proof.

Thanks to the above decomposition of the set of bilinear interactions we can assert that

$$\left(\mathcal{FQ}(U,U)|\, e^0\right) = \sum_{i=0}^{3} \mathcal{B}_i,$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_i(n) = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{(k,m,n)\in\mathcal{R}_i \\ j=1,2,3}} \left(U^{a,j}(k)\, m_j U^{b,j'}(m) \middle| e^0(n) \right) \left| e^0(n) \right|^2 .$$

We start at this point to study the resonance effect on the expression (4.5). Indeed the triple $(a,b,c) = (0,0,0)$ is admissible which determinate the bilinear interaction set $\mathcal{R}_0$. Namely $\mathcal{R}_0$ describes the set of blinear interactions between element of $\ker \mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}$. The term $\mathcal{B}_0$ gives hence a non-null contribution, we want to show that the contributions coming from the other $\mathcal{B}_i$'s are null. At first let us suppose that $a = b \neq 0$, i.e. we are considering the contributions coming from the term $\mathcal{B}_1$ which is defined by the resonant set $\mathcal{R}_1$. Let us say $a = b = +$. Whence the resonance condition $\omega^{+,+,0}_{k,m,n} = 0$ reads as $|k_h| = |m_h| = 0$.
As it was proved in Section 2 in the case in which $n_h = 0$ the eigenvalues collapse all to zero, and hence we obtain that

$$\left\{ (k,m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^9 : \omega^{+,+,0}_{k,m,n}, k+m=n \right\} \subset \mathcal{R}_0.$$

The very same analysis can be done for the triplets $(-,-,0), (\pm,0,0), (0,\pm,0)$, and hence to prove that $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_2 = 0$.
What is left hence at this point is to prove that the triplets $(\pm,\mp,0)$ do not produce any bilinear interaction, or, alternatively, to prove that the contribution coming from $\mathcal{B}_3$ is zero. To do so let us set

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}^a_n &= \left(\hat{U}(n) \middle| e^a(n) \right), \\ C^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n} &= \sum_{j=1}^{3} e^{a,j}(k)\, m_j \left(e^b(m) \middle| e^c(n) \right), \end{aligned}$$

in particular with this notation the limit form (4.5) can be written as

$$\mathcal{FQ}(U,U) = \mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}=0 \\ k+m=n}} C^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n} \hat{U}^a_k \hat{U}^b_m e^c(n).$$

Let us consider at this point the resonant condition $\omega^{\pm}(k) + \omega^{\mp}(m) = 0$, it is equivalent, after some algebraic manipulation, considering the explicit expression of the eigenvalues given in (2.4) to

$$k_3^2 |m_h|^2 = m_3^2 |k_h|^2 . \tag{4.6}$$

Some straightforward computations, using the explicit expression of the eigenvectors given in (2.5) gives us that

$$C^{-,+,0}_{k,m,n} = C^{+,-,0}_{k,m,n} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} C^{\pm,0}_{k,m,n} \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{4.7}$$

Moreover $\hat{U}^{\pm}_n = \pm i\, c(n) + d(n)$, c and d are complex-valued and assume the following form

$$\begin{aligned} c(n) =& \frac{n_1 n_3}{|n_h|\ |n|} \hat{U}^1 + \frac{n_2 n_3}{|n_h|\ |n|} \hat{U}^2 - \frac{|n_h|}{|n|} \hat{U}^3, \\ d(n) =& \hat{U}^4. \end{aligned}$$

The $\hat{U}^i$ above is the i-th component of the Fourier transform of U. Hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}^{\mp}_k \hat{U}^{\pm}_m &= C(k,m) \pm i D(k,m), \\ C(k,m) &= c(k)\, c(m) + d(k)\, d(m), \\ D(k,m) &= c(k)\, d(m) - c(m)\, d(k), \end{aligned}$$

with C symmetric and D skew-symmetric with respect to k and m. With these considerations hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{\omega^{\pm,\mp,0}_{k,m,n}=0\\ k+m=n}} C^{\pm,\mp,0}_{k,m,n}\hat{U}^{\pm}_k\hat{U}^{\mp}_m &= \sum_{\substack{k_3^2|m_h|^2=m_3^2|k_h|^2\\ k+m=n}} \left(C^{-,+,0}_{k,m,n}\hat{U}^{-}_k\hat{U}^{+}_m + C^{+,-,0}_{k,m,n}\hat{U}^{+}_k\hat{U}^{-}_m\right),\\ &= \sum_{\substack{k_3^2|m_h|^2=m_3^2|k_h|^2\\ k+m=n}} C^{\pm,0}_{k,m,n}C\left(k,m\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

We rely now on the following lemma whose proof is postponed at page 28.

Lemma 4.4. *Under the convolution constraint $k+m=n$ the element $C^{\pm,0}_{k,m,k+m}$ defined in (4.7), is skew symmetric with respect to the variables k,m.*

Using at this point Lemma 4.4 it is easy to conclude. If we consider the expression in (4.8), and we remark that the summation set, given by the relation (4.6), is symmetric with respect to k and m, since C is symmetric and $C^{\pm,0}_{k,m,k+m}$ is skew symmetric we obtain that the sum in (4.8) is zero, hence the only admissible triple in $(0,0,0)$.
At this point hence all that remains is to fully describe what is the sum

$$\left(\mathcal{FQ}\left(U,U\right)|\, e^0\right) = \left(\mathbb{P}_n \sum_{\substack{k+m=n\\ j=1,2,3}} \hat{U}^0_k\hat{U}^0_m e^{0,j}\left(k\right) m_j \left(e^0\left(m\right)\middle|\, e^0\left(n\right)\right)\ e^0(n)\middle|\, e^0\left(n\right)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}.$$

The matrix $\mathbb{P}_n$ is symmetric and purely real, hence selfadjoint, and the vector e^0 is divergence-free, this implies that

$$\left(\mathcal{FQ}\left(U,U\right)|\, e^0\right) = \sum_{\substack{k+m=n\\ j=1,2,3}} \hat{U}^0_k\hat{U}^0_m e^{0,j}\left(k\right) m_j \left(e^0\left(m\right)\middle|\, e^0\left(n\right)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\ \left|e^0(n)\right|^2,$$

by our choice of e^0 (see (2.5)) we have that $\left|e^0(n)\right|^2 \equiv 1$ and a straightforward computation gives us that, considering the relations defined in (3.1),

$$\sum_{j=1}^{3} \hat{U}^0_{\bar{k}}\hat{U}^0_{\bar{m}} e^{0,j}\left(\bar{k}\right)\bar{m}_j = \mathcal{F}\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\tilde{\psi}\right)\left(\bar{n}\right),$$

where $\bar{k}+\bar{m}=\bar{n}$, whence evaluating what $\left(e^0\left(m\right)\middle|\, e^0\left(n\right)\right)$ is, under the convolution condition $k+m=n$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(e^0\left(m\right)\middle|\, e^0\left(n\right)\right) =& \frac{1}{|n_h|\,|m_h|}\left(n_1m_1+n_2m_2\right),\\ =& \frac{1}{|n_h|\,|m_h|}\left[\left(m_1^2+m_2^2\right)+\left(k_1m_1+k_2m_2\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

At this point we first apply the operator $\frac{1}{|n_h||m_h|}\left(m_1^2+m_2^2\right)$ to the element evaluated above $\mathcal{F}\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\tilde{\psi}\right)(n)$, this gives

$$\mathcal{F}\left(\Delta_h^{-1/2}\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\omega^h\right)\right)(n),$$

while computing

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{|n_h|\,|m_h|}\left(k_1m_1+k_2m_2\right)\mathcal{F}\left(\bar{u}^1\partial_1\tilde{\psi}+\bar{u}^2\partial_2\tilde{\psi}\right)=&\frac{1}{|n_h|}\left(k_1m_1+k_2m_2\right)\mathcal{F}\left(\bar{u}^1\partial_1\psi+\bar{u}^2\partial_2\psi\right),\\ =&\frac{1}{|n_h|}\mathcal{F}\left(\partial_1\bar{u}^1\partial_1^2\psi+\partial_2\bar{u}^2\partial_2^2\psi+\partial_2\bar{u}^1\partial_{1,2}^2\psi+\partial_1\bar{u}^2\partial_{1,2}^2\psi\right),\\ =&0,\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we used the relation $\bar{u}^h=\begin{pmatrix}-\partial_2\psi\\ \partial_1\psi\end{pmatrix}$ already defined in (3.1).
Putting together all the results we hence obtained that

$$\left(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)|\,e^0\right)=\mathcal{F}\left(\Delta_h^{-1/2}\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\omega^h\right)\right),$$

which concludes the proof of the lemma. □

This concludes the proof of the Step 2, the bilinear interactions of the kernel part are the same as the ones present in the evolution equation for 2d Euler equations in vorticity form.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. We recall that

$$\frac{1}{2}C_{k,m,n}^{\pm,0}=\sum_{j=1}^{3}e^{\pm,j}\left(k\right)m_j\left(e^{\pm}\left(m\right)|\,e^0\left(n\right)\right),$$

whence in particular thanks to the explicit expressions of the eigenvectors $e^{\pm}$ given in (2.5) and the convolution constrain $k+m=n$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}-\frac{1}{2}C_{k,m,k+m}^{\pm,0}=&\left(k_1k_3m_1+k_2k_3m_2-|k_h|^2m_3\right)\left(m_2m_3\left(k_1+m_1\right)-m_1m_3\left(k_2+m_2\right)\right)\\ =&\left(m_1m_2m_3k_1^2k_3-k_1k_2k_3m_1^2m_3\right)+\left(k_1k_2k_3m_2^2m_3-m_1m_2m_3k_2^2k_3\right),\end{aligned}$$

which is indeed skew-symmetric. □

4.1.2. *Proof of Step 3.* It remains to understand how the projection onto the non-oscillating space $\mathbb{C}e^0$ affects the second-order linear operator $\mathbb{D}$ defined in (1.2). I.e. we want to prove the Step 3 of the list above. We study the limit as $\varepsilon\to0$ of the second order linear part. The result we prove is the following one

Lemma 4.5. *The following limit holds in the sense of distributions*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(-\mathcal{F}\left(\mathbb{D}^{\varepsilon}U^{\varepsilon}\right)_n|\,|n_h|\,e^0\left(n\right)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}\right)=-\nu\Delta\omega^h.$$

Proof. Let us write explicitly what $\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left(-\mathcal{F}\left(\mathbb{D}^{\varepsilon}U^{\varepsilon}\right)_n|\,|n_h|\,e^0\left(n\right)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}$ is. By the aid of the limit formulation for the second order linear differential operator given in (3.5) and some computations which can be performed explicitly thanks to the exact formulation of the eigevector e^0 given in (2.5) (and recalling that the eigenvectors (2.5) are orthonormal) we deduce

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to0}\left(-\mathcal{F}\left(\mathbb{D}^{\varepsilon}U^{\varepsilon}\right)_n|\,|n_h|\,e^0\left(n\right)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}=\sum_{\omega_n^{0,b}=0}\nu\,|n|^2\left(-n_2U^{b,1}+n_1U^{b,2}\right).\tag{4.9}$$

$\omega_n^{a,b}=\omega^a\left(n\right)-\omega^b\left(n\right)$. Let us consider hence what the interaction condition $\omega_n^{0,b}=0$ means. If $b=\pm$ than indeed $\omega_n^{0,b}=0$ is equivalent to $n_h=0$ since the equation we derive it the following one

$$\frac{|n_h|}{|n|}=0.$$

As it has been explained in Section 2 as long as $n_h=0$ the eigenvalue corresponding, i.e. ω^b, it collapses to zero, and hence it belongs to the kernel of the penalized operator. This implies that in

(4.9) the only nonzero contributions are given if $b = 0$, proving Step 3.

□

With the proof of Step 1–Step 3 above we hence proved that, given an initial ω_0^h, the element

$$\omega^h = \mathrm{curl}_h \bar{u}^h,$$

solves in the sense of distribution the following Navier-Stokes system in vorticity form

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega^h + \bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \omega^h - \nu \Delta \omega^h = 0, \\ \omega^h \Big|_{t=0} = \omega_0^h. \end{cases} \tag{4.10}$$

We hence apply the 2d-Biot-Savart law

$$\bar{u}^h = \nabla_h^\perp \Delta_h^{-1} \omega^h,$$

to the system (4.10) to deduce the claim of Proposition 4.2.

4.2. **Derivation of the equation for U_{osc}.** The result we want to prove in the present section is the following one

Proposition 4.6. *Let be $U_{\mathrm{osc},0} = V_0 - \bar{U}_0 \in L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$. Then the projection of U distributional solution of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto the oscillating space defined $\mathbb{C}e^- \oplus \mathbb{C}e^+$ defined as*

$$U_{\mathrm{osc}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\left(\mathcal{F}U \middle| e^-\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} \ e^- + \left(\mathcal{F}U \middle| e^+\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} \ e^+\right)$$

satisfies, for almost all $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ parameters defining the three-dimensional periodic domain $\mathbb{T}^3$ the linear equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U_{\mathrm{osc}} + 2\mathcal{Q}\left(\bar{U}, U_{\mathrm{osc}}\right) - \left(\nu + \nu'\right) \Delta U_{\mathrm{osc}} = 0, \\ U_{\mathrm{osc}}|_{t=0} = U_{\mathrm{osc},0}, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{Q}$ is defined (3.4).

Step 1 We project the equation $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ onto the oscillatory space generated by the vectors e^-, e^+ defined in (2.5). We recall again that such projection is defined as follows (see (3.3) as well): given a vector field W the orthogonal projection onto the oscillating subspace is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}\, W_{\mathrm{osc}} = \left(\hat{W} \middle| e^-\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} \ e^- + \left(\hat{W} \middle| e^+\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} \ e^+,$$

with this decomposition we can derive the evolution equation for the limit flow U, i.e.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U_{\mathrm{osc}} + \left(\mathcal{Q}\left(U, U\right)\right)_{\mathrm{osc}} - \left(\mathbb{D}\, U\right)_{\mathrm{osc}} = 0, \\ U_{\mathrm{osc}}|_{t=0} = U_{\mathrm{osc},0} = V_{\mathrm{osc},0}. \end{cases} \tag{4.11}$$

Step 2 Next we turn our attention to the oscillating part of the bilinear interaction $\left(\mathcal{Q}\left(U, U\right)\right)_{\mathrm{osc}}$. We prove that for almost all tori

$$\left(\mathcal{Q}\left(U, U\right)\right)_{\mathrm{osc}} = 2\mathcal{Q}\left(\bar{U}, U_{\mathrm{osc}}\right).$$

This result is not a free-deduction and it can be attained only thanks to some geometrical hypothesis on the domain. We say in fact in this case that we consider *non-resonant* domain. A direct consequence is that U_{osc} satisfies hence a *linear equation*, hence it is globally well posed if the perturbation $\bar{U}$ acting on his evolution system is globally well posed as well.

Step 3 The last step of this section is to prove that

$$-\left(\mathbb{D}\, U\right)_{\mathrm{osc}} = -\left(\nu + \nu'\right) \Delta U_{\mathrm{osc}}.$$

As well as in the previous section in order to prove Proposition 4.6 it i to prove Step 1–Step 3 above.

As well as above the Step 1 consists of constructive considerations only, hence there is nothing really to prove

4.2.1. *Proof of Step 2.* Our goal is to study the interaction of the kind $\left(\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(U^{\varepsilon},U^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)_{\text{osc}}$, hence to prove the Step 2. These are bilinear interactions between highly oscillating nodes. These create a bilinear interaction of the same form of the classical three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations, hence we want to prove is that in the limit as $\varepsilon\to 0$, far almost each torus $\mathbb{T}^3$, there is no bilinear interaction of the form $\left(\mathcal{Q}\left(U_{\text{osc}},U_{\text{osc}}\right)\right)_{\text{osc}}$. This is the scope of the following lemma

Lemma 4.7. *For almost each torus $\mathbb{T}^3$ the following limit holds in the sense of distributions*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(U^{\varepsilon},U^{\varepsilon}\right)_{\text{osc}}=2\mathcal{Q}\left(\bar{U},U_{\text{osc}}\right).$$

Proof. In the proof of this lemma we shall see how the resonant effects play a fundamental role in the limit of the projection of the bilinear form onto the oscillatory space. In this proof only we will use again the check notation on the Fourier nodes since the structure of the torus itself shall play a significant role. First of all we recall that

$$\left(\mathcal{F}\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(U^{\varepsilon},U^{\varepsilon}\right)\right)_{\text{osc}}=\left(\mathbb{P}_n\sum_{\substack{a,b,c\in\{0,\pm\}\\ k+m=n}}e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,m,n}}\left(\sum_{j=1,2,3}U^{a,\varepsilon,j}\left(k\right)m_jU^{b,\varepsilon}\left(m\right)\Big|e^{c}\left(n\right)\right)e^{c}\left(n\right)\right)_{\text{osc}},$$

whence, since $F_{\text{osc}}=\left(F\right|e^{\pm}\left)e^{\pm}\right.$ and $e^0\perp e^{\pm}$ we easily deduce that $c=\pm$. Letting $\varepsilon\to 0$ by stationary phase theorem all that remain are interactions of the form,

$$\mathcal{F}\mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)=\mathbb{P}_n\sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,\pm}_{k,m,n}=0\\ k+m=n\\ j=1,2,3}}\left(U^{a,j}\left(k\right)m_jU^{b}\left(m\right)\Big|e^{\pm}\left(n\right)\right)e^{\pm}\left(n\right),$$

and in particular we focus on the ones which have purely highly oscillating nodes interacting, i.e. when $a=\pm,b=\pm$ (but they may be different the one from the other) and the frequency set of bilinear interaction satisfies the relation

$$\frac{\left|\check{k}_h\right|}{\left|\check{k}\right|}+\epsilon_1\frac{|\check{m}_h|}{|\check{m}|}=\epsilon_2\frac{|\check{n}_h|}{|\check{n}|}\qquad\qquad\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2=\pm 1. \tag{4.12}$$

We want to prove, specifically, that the bilinear interaction restricted on these nodes gives a zero contribution for almost all tori.
The above relation can be expressed as a polynomial in the variables $\left(\check{k},\check{m},\check{n}\right)$ at the cost of long

and tedious computations. In particular we shall use the following expansion

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4.13)\quad 2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2|\check{m}_h|^2\left(\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2+\left|\check{k}_3\right|^2\right)\left(|\check{m}_h|^2+|\check{m}_3|^2\right)\left(|\check{n}_h|^4+|\check{n}_3|^4+2|\check{n}_h|^2\check{n}_3^2\right)= \\
\left|\check{k}_h\right|^4\left(|\check{m}_h|^4+\check{m}_3^4+2|\check{m}_h|^2\check{m}_3^2\right)\left(|\check{n}_h|^4+\check{n}_3^4+2|\check{n}_h|^2\check{n}_3^2\right) \\
+|\check{m}_h|^4\left(\left|\check{k}_h\right|^4+\check{k}_3^4+2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2\check{k}_3^2\right)\left(|\check{n}_h|^4+\check{n}_3^4+2|\check{n}_h|^2\check{n}_3^2\right) \\
+|\check{n}_h|^4\left(\left|\check{k}_h\right|^4+\check{k}_3^4+2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2\check{k}_3^2\right)\left(|\check{m}_h|^4+\check{m}_3^4+2|\check{m}_h|^2\check{m}_3^2\right) \\
-2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2|\check{n}_h|^2\left(\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2+\check{k}_3^2\right)\left(|\check{n}_h|^2+\check{n}_3^2\right)\left(|\check{m}_h|^4+\check{m}_3^4+2|\check{m}_h|^2\check{m}_3^2\right) \\
-2|\check{m}_h|^2|\check{n}_h|^2\left(|\check{m}_h|^2+\check{m}_3^2\right)\left(|\check{n}_h|^2+\check{n}_3^2\right)\left(\left|\check{k}_h\right|^4+\check{k}_3^4+2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2\check{k}_3^2\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

I We underline the fact that (4.12) and (4.13) are equivalent. The expression in (4.13) could be further expanded and refined, but for our purposes the form in (4.13) shall be sufficient.
We take the expression in (4.13) and we evaluate the sum of monomials in the leading order in the variables $\check{k}_h, \check{m}_h, \check{n}_h$, which is

$$
\check{P}_0\left(\check{k}_h, \check{m}_h\right) = -3\left|\check{k}_h\right|^4|\check{m}_h|^4|\check{n}_h|^4,
$$

while the sum of monomial in the leading order for the variables $\check{k}_3, \check{m}_3, \check{n}_3$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\check{P}_8\left(\check{k}, \check{m}\right) = \check{m}_3^4\check{n}_3^4\left|\check{k}_h\right|^4+\check{k}_3^4\check{n}_3^4|\check{m}_h|^4+\check{k}_3^4\check{m}_3^4|\check{n}_h|^4 \\
-2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2|\check{m}_h|^2\check{k}_3^2\check{m}_3^2\check{n}_3^4-2\left|\check{k}_h\right|^2|\check{n}_h|^2\check{k}_3^2\check{n}_3^2\check{m}_3^4-2|\check{m}_h|^2|\check{n}_h|^2\check{m}_3^2\check{n}_3^2\check{k}_3^4.
\end{aligned}
$$

We point out the $\check{P}_8$ is homogeneous of degree 8 in the variables $\check{k}_3, \check{m}_3, \check{n}_3$ while $\check{P}_0$ is homogeneous of degree zero.
Since $\check{P}_8\left(\check{k}, \check{m}\right)$ is homogeneous of degree 8 we can rewrite is as

$$
\check{P}_8\left(\check{k}, \check{m}\right) = \check{P}_8\left(\frac{k}{a}, \frac{m}{a}\right) = a_3^{-8}P_8\left(k, m, a_h\right).
$$

Since a_1, a_2, a_3 are parameters of a torus we can indeed consider them different from 0. Moreover

$$
P_0\left(k, m, a_h\right) = -3\left(a_1a_2\right)^{-12}\left(a_2^2k_1^2+a_1^2k_2^2\right)^2\left(a_2^2m_1^2+a_1^2m_2^2\right)^2\left(a_2^2n_1^2+a_1^2n_2^2\right)^2 = 0,
$$

if and only of k_h or m_h or $n_h = k_h + m_h$ is equal to zero. Let us suppose hence that one of these three conditions is satisfied. We have seen in Section 2 that once we consider (say) $n_h = 0$ all the eigenvalues collapse to the degenerate case of $\omega = 0$ with multiplicity four, whence there is no triple interaction of highly oscillating nodes and we can consider $k_h, m_h, n_h \neq 0$.
As explained under this condition hence $P_0\left(k, m, a_h\right) \neq 0$, hence we can rewrite the resonant condition (4.13) in the abstract form

$$
(4.14)\qquad P_0\left(k, m, a_h\right)a_3^8 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} P_\alpha\left(k, m, a_h\right)a_3^{8-\alpha} = 0,
$$

where we made sure that $P_0\left(k, m, a_h\right) \neq 0$. Whence fixing $(k, m, a_h) \in \mathbb{Z}^6 \times \left(\mathbb{R}_+\right)^2$ we can state that there exists a finite $a_3\left(k, m, a_h\right)$ solving (4.14). These elements are finite and unique once we fix a 8-tuple (k, m, a_h). At this point hence it is obvious that

$$
a_3\left(\mathbb{Z}^6, a_h\right) = \bigcup_{(k,m)\in\mathbb{Z}^6} a_3\left(k, m, a_h\right),
$$

has zero measure in $\mathbb{R}$. Whence we proved that outside a null measure set in $\mathbb{R}^3$ there is not bilinear interaction of highly oscillating nodes, proving the lemma. □

4.2.2. *Proof of Step 3.* It remains hence only to prove the Step 3 above, i.e. to understand the (distributional) limit as $\varepsilon \to 0$ of the interaction generated by the second-order elliptic operator $\mathbb{D}$ defined in (1.2). This is done in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.8. *The following limit holds in the sense of distributions*

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon \middle| e^- + e^+\right) = -\left(\nu + \nu'\right) \Delta U_{\text{osc}}.$$

Proof. We proceed as follows. By definition of the projection onto the oscillatory space (see (3.3) $\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon\right)_{\text{osc}}$ is given by the formula (3.5)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon U^\varepsilon\right)_{\text{osc}}(n) &= \sum_{\omega_n^{a,\pm}=0} \left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\,\hat{U}^\varepsilon(n)\middle| e^\pm(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^\pm(n), \\
&= \sum_{\omega_n^{+,+}=0} \left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\,\hat{U}^{\varepsilon,+}(n)\ e^+(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^+(n) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\omega_n^{-,+}=0} \left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\,\hat{U}^{\varepsilon,-}(n)\ e^-(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^+(n) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\omega_n^{+,-}=0} \left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\,\hat{U}^{\varepsilon,+}(n)\ e^+(n)\middle| e^-(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^-(n) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\omega_n^{-,-}=0} \left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\,\hat{U}^{\varepsilon,-}(n)\ e^-(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} e^-(n),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where for the second equality we used the decomposition $\hat{U}^\varepsilon = \sum_{a=0,\pm} \hat{U}^{a,\varepsilon}\, e^a$ and the fact that the eigenvectors are orthogonal.
Computing the explicit expression of $\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\, e^+(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\, e^+(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} &= \left(-\mathbb{D}(n)\, e^{-i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega(n)}\ e^+(n)\middle|\ e^{-i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega(n)}\ e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}, \\
&= \left(-\mathbb{D}(n)\, e^+(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}, \\
&= \left(\nu + \nu'\right)\ |n|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

While for the element $\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\, e^-(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4}$

$$\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\, e^-(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} = e^{2i\,\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega(n)} \left(-\mathbb{D}(n)\, e^-(n)\middle| e^+(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} \to 0, \tag{4.17}$$

in the sense of distributions thanks to the stationary phase theorem. In this case we automatically excluded the case $\omega(n) = 0$ since, as explained in Section 2, saying $\omega(n) = 0$ is equivalent to say that $n_h = 0$ and hence, in this case, all eigenvectors belong to the kernel of the penalized operator and hence $\mathcal{Q}(U,U)_{\text{osc}}|_{n_h=0} = 0$.
The same ideas can be applied to deduce

$$\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\, e^-(n)\middle| e^-(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} = \left(\nu + \nu'\right)\ |n|^2, \tag{4.18}$$

$$\left(-\mathbb{D}^\varepsilon(n)\, e^+(n)\middle| e^-(n)\right)_{\mathbb{C}^4} \to 0. \tag{4.19}$$

The limit (4.19) has to be understood in the sense of distributions. Inserting (4.16)–(4.19) into (4.15) we deduce the claim, proving the Step 3. □

5. Global existence of the limit system.

In Section 4.1 and 4.2 we performed a careful analysis whose goal was to understand which equations are solved (in the sense of distributions) by the functions $\bar{U}$ and U_{osc} which were defined as the projection respectively onto the non-oscillating subspace $\mathbb{C}e^0$ and the oscillating space $\mathbb{C}e^- \oplus \mathbb{C}e^+$ of U, distributional solution of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$. The present section is devoted to study the propagation of strong (Sobolev) norms under the assumption that the initial data is sufficiently regular.
In particular we are interested to understand if the system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ propagates (isotropic) Sobolev data $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), s > 1/2$ and, if so, under which conditions on the initial data. Our expectation in that such system can propagate super-critical Sobolev regularity globally-in-time without any particular smallness assumption on the initial data. The resul we prove is the following one:

Proposition 5.1. *Let $U_0 \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right) \cap L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}^2_h\right)\right)$, and $\nabla_h U \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}^2_h\right)\right)$ for $s > 1/2, \sigma > 0$, and let U be of zero horizontal average, i.e.*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2_h} U_0\left(x_h, x_3\right) \mathrm{d}x_h = 0 \text{ for each } x_3 \in \mathbb{T}^1_v,$$

then the weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^h + \mathbb{P}\left(\bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}^h\right) - \nu \Delta \bar{u}^h = 0, \\ \operatorname{div}_h \bar{u}^h = 0, \\ U(0,x) = U_0 \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

is in fact strong, and has the following regularity:

$$\bar{u}^h \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

Moreover for each $t > 0$ the following estimate holds true

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \nu \int_0^t \left\|\bar{u}^h(\tau)\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant C \left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \\ &\times \exp\left\{ \frac{CK}{c\nu} \exp\left\{ \frac{CK^2 \left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}}{c\nu} \exp\left\{ \frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1 + \left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right) \left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)} \right\} \right\} \left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v(H^\sigma_h)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Moreover if $U_{\text{osc},0} \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), s > 1/2$ then U_{osc}, weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t U_{\text{osc}} + 2\mathcal{Q}\left(\bar{U}, U_{\text{osc}}\right) - \left(\nu + \nu'\right) \Delta U_{\text{osc}} = 0, \\ U_{\text{osc}}|_{t=0} = U_{\text{osc},0}. \end{cases}$$

is global-in-time and belongs to the space

$$U_{\text{osc}} \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

for $s > 1/2$. For each $t > 0$ the following bound holds true

$$\left\|U_{\text{osc}}(t)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \frac{\nu + \nu'}{2} \int_0^t \left\|U_{\text{osc}}(\tau)\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)} \mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant C \left\|U_{\text{osc},0}\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \exp\left\{ C \left\|\nabla \bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s(\mathbb{T}^3))} \right\}.$$

Thanks to the bounds above we can hence claim that, if $U_0 \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right) \cap L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^2_h\right)\right)$, and $\nabla_h U \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^2_h\right)\right)$ for $s > 1/2$, and let U be of zero horizontal average, then

$$U = \bar{U} + U_{\text{osc}},$$

distributional solution of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ is in fact global-in-time and belongs to the space

$$U \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

for $s > 1/2$.

The statement of Proposition 5.1 is divided in two macro areas:

(1) Control of strong Sobolev norms for the kernel-part of the solution $\bar{U}$.
(2) Control of strong Sobolev norms for the orthogonal of the kernel-part of the solution U_{osc}.

The derivation of the regularity of $U = \bar{U} + U_{\text{osc}}$ is hence a simple deduction due to the orthogonality of $\bar{U}$ and U_{osc}.

We shall hence divide the proof of Proposition 5.1 in the next two sub-sections: at first we prove the propagation of Sobolev norms for $\bar{U}$, then we prove the same result for U_{osc}.

5.1. **The kernel part: propagation of $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), s > 1/2$ data.** The equation (4.10) is the vorticity equation associated to $\bar{u}^h$, this comes from the fact that $\nabla_h^\perp \cdot \bar{u}^h = \omega^h$ and hence $\nabla_h^\perp \cdot \left(u - \bar{u}^h\right) = 0$. Whence $\bar{u}^h$ satisfies the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^h + \bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}^h - \nu \Delta \bar{u}^h = -\nabla_h \bar{p}^h, \\ \text{div}_{\,h} \bar{u}^h = 0, \\ \bar{U}\left(0, x\right) = \bar{U}_0\left(x\right). \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

This tells us that $\bar{u}^h$ satisfies a stratified 2D Euler equation with full diffusion. In particular the following 2D Biot-Savart Law holds

$$\bar{u}^h = \nabla_h^\perp \Delta_h^{-1} \omega^h. \tag{5.4}$$

The following result is classical in the theory on 2D Navier-Stokes equation (for a proof we refer to [4]):

Lemma 5.2. *Let* $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$ *(or* $v : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{T}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$*). Fixed* x_3*, if* $v_0\left(\cdot, x_3\right) \in H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)$ *for* $\sigma > 0$ *there exists a solution* $v\left(\cdot, x_3\right)$ *of the equation*

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t v\left(\cdot, x_3\right) + v\left(\cdot, x_3\right) \cdot \nabla_h v\left(\cdot, x_3\right) - \nu \Delta_h v\left(\cdot, x_3\right) = -\nabla_h \tilde{p}\left(\cdot, x_3\right), \\ \nabla_h \cdot v^h\left(\cdot, x_3\right) = 0, \\ v\left(\cdot, x_3\right)|_{t=0} = v_0\left(\cdot, x_3\right), \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

such that $v\left(\cdot, x_3\right) \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{\sigma+1}\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)\right)$ *and in particular the following estimate holds for each* $t > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|v\left(t, \cdot, x_3\right)\right\|_{H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)}^2 + \nu \int_0^t \left\|\nabla_h v\left(\tau, \cdot, x_3\right)\right\|_{H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \\ &\qquad \leqslant C \left\|v_0\left(\cdot, x_3\right)\right\|_{H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)}^2 \exp\left\{\int_0^t \left(1 + \left\|v\left(\tau \cdot, x_3\right)\right\|_{L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_h^2\right)}^2\right) \left\|\nabla_h v\left(\tau \cdot, x_3\right)\right\|_{L^2\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right)}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau, \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

the very same result holds in the periodic setting.

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $\bar{u}_0^h \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right), s > 1/2$ *and of zero horizontal average i.e.*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}_0^h\left(y_h, x_3\right) \mathrm{d}y_h = 0.$$

The function $\bar{u}^h$ *local solution of* (5.3) *defined in the space*

$$\bar{u}^h \in \mathcal{C}\left(\left[0, T^\star\right]; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\left[0, T^\star\right]; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

for some $T^\star > 0$ is of zero horizontal average in its lifespan, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}^h(t, y_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}y_h = 0,$$

for each $0 < t < T^\star$.

Proof. Let us take the operator $\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \cdot\,\mathrm{d}x_h$ on both sides of (5.3), we obtain

$$\partial_t \int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}^h(t, x_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}x_h - \nu\partial_3^2 \int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}^h(t, x_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}x_h = 0.$$

In particular hence if we define $\mathcal{A}(t, x_3) = \int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}^h(t, x_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}x_h$ the above equation becomes a 1-dimensional periodic linear homogeneous diffusion equation whose unique solution is

$$\mathcal{A}(t, x_3) = \mathcal{F}_v^{-1}\left(e^{-n_3^2 t}\mathcal{F}_v\mathcal{A}_0\right),$$

whence if we suppose $\mathcal{A}_0(x_3) = \int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}_0^h(x_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}x_h \equiv 0$ for each $x_3 \in \mathbb{T}_v$ we indeed obtain that, in $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$, $\mathcal{A}(t, x_3) \equiv 0$, which means that the horizontal average is identically zero. □

Remark 5.4. The above lemma in particular implies that, for local solutions of equation (5.3), the horizontal homogeneous and nonhommogeneous Sobolev spaces are equivalent i.e.

$$\left\|(-\Delta_h)^{s/2} u(\cdot, x_3)\right\|_{L_h^2} \sim \|u(\cdot, x_3)\|_{H_h^s}.$$

For this reason, from now on, we shall always use the nonhomogeneous Sobolev space (although, as explained, for equation (5.3) they are equivalent) since the embedding $H^{1+\varepsilon}\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right) \hookrightarrow L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right), \varepsilon > 0$ holds true (which is not the case with homogeneous spaces, generally) and we do not leave any place to ambiguity. ⧫

The main result of the present section shall be the first part of the claim of Proposition 5.1, namely

Proposition 5.5. *Let $U_0 \in H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right) \cap L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right)\right)$, and $\nabla_h U \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}_v; H^\sigma\left(\mathbb{T}_h^2\right)\right)$ for $s > 1/2, \sigma > 0$, and let U be of zero horizontal average, i.e.*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} U_0(x_h, x_3)\,\mathrm{d}x_h = 0 \text{ for each } x_3 \in \mathbb{T}_v^1,$$

then the weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \bar{u}^h + \mathbb{P}\left(\bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \bar{u}^h\right) - \nu\Delta\bar{u}^h = 0, \\ \operatorname{div}_h \bar{u}^h = 0, \\ U(0, x) = U_0 \end{cases} \tag{5.7}$$

is in fact strong, and has the following regularity:

$$\bar{u}^h \in \mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

Moreover for each $t > 0$ the following estimate holds true

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \nu\int_0^t \left\|\bar{u}^h(\tau)\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \mathrm{d}\tau \leqslant C\left\|\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2$$
$$\times\exp\left\{\frac{CK}{c\nu}\ \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)}^2}{c\nu}\exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1 + \left\|\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)}^2\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^\infty(L_h^2)}^2\right\}\right\}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^p(H_h^\sigma)}\right\}.$$

Let us first remark that Lemma 5.2 applies to (5.3) for x_3 fixed. Now in order to apply Theorem 1.4 the regularity result stated in Lemma 5.2 are not sufficient, in fact what we require an $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ estimate in all the variables.
The following two sections exist to this scope

5.1.1. *The kernel part : smoothing effects oh the heat flow.* This first subsection is aimed to prove some global-in-time integrability results for some suitable norms for (weak) solutions of the limit system (5.3). The result we present here are a consequence of the fact that (5.3) is a transport-diffusion equation in the horizontal variables, but a purely diffusion equation in the vertical one, in the sense that there is no vertical transport contribution.

The final result we want to prove is the following one

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\bar{u}^h$ be a weak solution of (5.3), and assume that $\bar{u}_0^h, \nabla_h \bar{u}_0^h \in L_v^\infty\left(H_h^\sigma\right)$. Let the inital data be of zero horizontal average, i.e.*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}_h^2} \bar{u}_0^h\left(y_h, x_3\right) \mathrm{d}y_h = 0,$$

for each $x_3 \in \mathbb{T}_v^1$. Then the solution $\bar{u}^h$ belongs to the space

$$\bar{u}^h \in L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

and in particular

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3))} \\
&\leqslant \frac{CK}{c\nu} \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^\infty\left(L_h^2\right)}^2}{c\nu} \exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^\infty\left(L_h^2\right)}^2\right)\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^\infty\left(L_h^2\right)}^2\right\}\right\}\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L_v^p\left(H_h^\sigma\right)},
\end{aligned}$$

where c, C, K are constants which do not depend by any parameter of the problem.

At first we prove some result on improved integrability of the solutions of (5.3) in anisotropic spaces. These results are attained studying the regularity properties of the heat kernel in the periodic setting. Let $f \in L^2\left([0, 2\pi a]\right)$, then we shall denote the one dimensional (vertical) heat kernel as

$$\mathcal{H}_v\left(t, \nu\right) f\left(z\right) = \mathcal{F}_v^{-1}\left\{\left(e^{-\nu t \frac{k^2}{a^2}} \hat{f}_k\right)_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}\right\}\left(z\right). \tag{5.8}$$

In particular the following property holds true

Lemma 5.7. *Let $\mathcal{H}_v$ be the heat kernel as above. For each $p \in [2, \infty]$, $t > 0$ and $f \in L^p\left([0, 2\pi a]\right)$ the heat kernel is a contraction of the $L^p\left([0, 2\pi a]\right)$ space, i.e.*

$$\left\|\mathcal{H}_v\left(t, \nu\right) f\right\|_{L^p([0,2\pi a])} \leqslant \|f\|_{L^p([0,2\pi a])}.$$

The result above, together with the following Poincaré inequality shall be crucial in the proof of time-smoothing effects we want to prove

Lemma 5.8. *Let $f \in W^{1,2}\left([0, 2\pi\ a_1] \times [0, 2\pi\ a_2]\right)$ and such that it zero average, i.e.*

$$\int_0^{2\pi\ a_1} \int_0^{2\pi\ a_2} f\left(x_1, x_2\right) \mathrm{d}x_2 \mathrm{d}x_1 = 0.$$

Then the following inequality holds true

$$\|f\|_{L^2([0,2\pi\ a_1]\times[0,2\pi\ a_2])} \leqslant C\left\|\nabla f\right\|_{L^2([0,2\pi\ a_1]\times[0,2\pi\ a_2])},$$

where in particular the constant C is independent by the parameters a_1, a_2 characterizing the torus $[0, 2\pi\ a_1] \times [0, 2\pi\ a_2]$.

The following lemma is a key step for the rest of the results presented in the present paper

Lemma 5.9. *Let $\bar{u}^h$ be a (weak) solution of the equation (5.3). Let us suppose moreover that $u_0, \nabla_h u_0 \in L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)$ for some $p \in [4, \infty]$. Let us assume as well that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^2_h} \bar{u}^h_0\left(y_h, x_3\right) \mathrm{d}y_h = 0,$$

for each $x_3 \in \mathbb{T}^1_v$. Then

$$\bar{u}^h \in L^q\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)\right), \qquad \text{for } q \in [1, \infty]\,,\ p \in [4, \infty]\,, \tag{5.9}$$

$$\nabla_h \bar{u}^h \in L^q\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)\right), \qquad \text{for } q \in [1, \infty]\,,\ p \in [4, \infty]\,. \tag{5.10}$$

In particular the time-decay rate is exponential, i.e.

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(t\right)\right\|_{L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)} \leqslant e^{-\nu c\, t} \left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)},$$

$$\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h\left(t\right)\right\|_{L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)} \leqslant K\ e^{-\nu c\, t} \left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)},$$

where c, K are strictly positive constants which depend on the dimension of the horizontal domain only (in this case two).

Proof. Let us multiply the equation (5.3) for $\bar{u}^h$ and let us take L^2_h scalar product. Since the vector field $\bar{u}^h$ is horizontal-divergence-free, i.e. $\partial_1 \bar{u}^1\left(x_1, x_2, x_3\right) + \partial_2 \bar{u}^2\left(x_1, x_2, x_3\right) = 0$ for each $x \in \mathbb{T}^3$ we deduce the following normed equality

$$\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} + \nu\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} + \nu\left\|\partial_3 \bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} - \nu\partial_3^2\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} = 0.$$

The term $\nu\left\|\partial_3^2 \bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}$ has indeed a positive contribution, hence we deduce the following inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} + \nu\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} - \nu\partial_3^2\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} \leqslant 0.$$

At the same time we can use the Poincaré inequality as stated in Lemma 5.8 to argue that

$$\nu\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} \geqslant c\nu\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h},$$

where $c = C^{-1}$ appearing in Lemma 5.8. Whence we deduced the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} + c\nu\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} - \nu\partial_3^2\left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} \leqslant 0.$$

Let us define (for the sake of notation) the function $\mathcal{U}^2\left(t, x_3\right) = \left\|\bar{u}^h\left(x_3\right)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}$. By mean of this new variable the above inequality reads as

$$\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\,\mathcal{U}^2\left(t, x_3\right) + c\nu\,\mathcal{U}^2\left(t, x_3\right) - \nu\partial_3^2\,\mathcal{U}^2\left(t, x_3\right) \leqslant 0.$$

By the maximum principle for parabolic equations we can hence deduce, from the above equation, that

$$\mathcal{U}^2\left(t, x_3\right) \leqslant\ e^{-2c\nu\, t}\mathcal{H}_v\left(t, 2\nu\right)\mathcal{U}^2_0\left(x_3\right),$$

taking the square root on both sides of the equation above and L^p_v norms we hence deduce

$$\|\mathcal{U}(t)\|_{L^p_v} \leqslant e^{-c\nu t} \left\|\mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\,\mathcal{U}_0^2\right\|^{1/2}_{L^{p/2}_v},$$

but, if $p \geqslant 4$ we know thanks to Lemma 5.7 the the heat kernel $\mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)$ maps $L^{p/2}_v$ to itself, hence we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{U}(t)\|_{L^p_v} &\leqslant e^{-c\nu t} \left\|\mathcal{U}_0^2\right\|^{1/2}_{L^{p/2}_v},\\ &\leqslant e^{-c\nu t} \|\mathcal{U}_0\|_{L^p_v},\end{aligned}$$

which reads, considering that the substitution performed was $\mathcal{U}^2(t,x_3) = \left\|\bar{u}^h(t,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}$, as

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|_{L^p_v(L^2_h)} \leqslant e^{-c\nu t} \left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v(L^2_h)},$$

and hence it has any L^q-in-time integrability.

To prove the statement for $\nabla_h \bar{u}^h$ let us consider the equation satisfied by $\omega^h = \mathrm{curl}_h \bar{u}^h$. The equation is the following one

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \omega^h + \bar{u}^h \cdot \nabla_h \omega^h - \nu \Delta \omega^h = 0, \\ \omega^h\Big|_{t=0} = \omega^h_0 = \mathrm{curl}_h \bar{u}^h_0. \end{cases}$$

We can perform the exactly same procedure as it has been done with $\bar{u}^h$, obtaining hence that

$$\left\|\omega^h(t)\right\|_{L^p_v(L^2_h)} \leqslant e^{-c\nu t} \left\|\omega^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v(L^2_h)}.$$

On the other hand we can define $\Omega^2(t,x_3) = \left\|\omega^h(t,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}$ and perform the same procedure done for $\bar{u}^h$, obtaining hence that

$$\Omega^2(t,x_3) \leqslant \mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\left(e^{-2c\nu t}\Omega^2_0(x_3)\right).$$

Since the application $\omega^h \mapsto \nabla_h \bar{u}^h$ is a Calderòn-Zygmund operator it maps continuously L^2_h to itself and has operator norm K, hence we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h(t,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} \leqslant K^2 \left\|\omega^h(t,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} = K^2\Omega^2(t,x_3) &\leqslant K^2 \mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\left(e^{-2c\nu t}\Omega^2_0(x_3)\right)\\ &= K^2\,\mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\left(e^{-2c\nu t}\left\|\omega^h_0(x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover $\left\|\omega^h_0(x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} \leqslant \left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0(x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}$ by definition, whence

$$\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h(t,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h} \leqslant K^2\, e^{-2c\nu t}\mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\left\|\nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0(x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}.$$

On the above equation we can take square roots on both sides and $L^p_v, p \geqslant 4$ norm as it has been done for $\bar{u}^h$ above obtaining the final bound

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|_{L^p_v(L^2_h)} \leqslant K\, e^{-c\nu t} \left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v(L^2_h)}.$$

□

Lemma 5.9 deals hence with the propagation of some anisotropic $L^p_v\left(L^2_h\right)$ regularity for (weak) solutions of equation (5.3). In our context we are particularly interested to study the propagation of the anisotropic $L^\infty_v\left(L^2_h\right)$ norm.
Similarly we are interested to understand how (5.3) propagates data which are bounded in the horizontal variables. Standard theory of two-dimensional Navier-Stokes and Euler equations (see Lemma 5.2) suggests that, if the data if sufficiently regular in terms of Sobolev regularity, the propagation of horizontal norms should not be problematic.
The regularity statements proved until now are not sufficient to perform our analysis, for this reason we require the following lemma

Lemma 5.10. *Let us consider $\bar{u}^h$ a (weak) solution of (5.3), let us consider the initial data $\bar{u}^h_0, \nabla_h \bar{u}^h_0 \in L^\infty_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right), \sigma \geqslant 0$ and ussume $\bar{u}^h_0$ has zero horizontal average, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^h \in & L^q\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)\right), && \text{for } q \in [1,\infty],\ p \in [4,\infty], \\ \nabla_h \bar{u}^h \in & L^q\left(\mathbb{R}_+; L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)\right), && \text{for } q \in [1,\infty],\ p \in [4,\infty]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover the decay rate of the $L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)$ norms is exponential-in-time, in particulat the following bounds hold

(5.11)
$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|_{L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)} \leqslant C \exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v\left(L^2_h\right)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v\left(L^2_h\right)}\right\} e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)},$$

(5.12)
$$\begin{aligned} &\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|_{L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)} \\ &\quad\leqslant CK \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^\infty_v\left(L^2_h\right)}}{c\nu} e^{\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v\left(L^2_h\right)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v\left(L^2_h\right)}\right\}}\right\} e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}t}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v\left(H^\sigma_h\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove at first (5.11).
Let us recall the bound

$$\begin{aligned} (5.13)\quad &\left(\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\cdot\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\middle|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)_{H^\sigma_h} \\ &\leqslant C\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{L^2_h}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{L^2_h}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^\sigma_h}, \\ &\leqslant C\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}+\frac{\nu}{2}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}, \\ &= C\,f(x_3)\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}+\frac{\nu}{2}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}, \end{aligned}$$

Performing an H^σ_h energy estimate onto (5.3) with the bound (5.13) we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}+\frac{\nu}{2}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}+\nu\left\|\partial_3\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}-\nu\partial_3^2\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h} \\ -C\,f(x_3)\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}\leqslant 0. \end{aligned}$$

By use of Lemma 5.8 and the fact that $\nu\left\|\partial_3\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}\geqslant 0$ we deduce

$$(5.14)\qquad \frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}+\left(\frac{c\nu}{2}-\nu\partial_3^2-C\,f(x_3)\right)\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}\leqslant 0.$$

Next we introduce the following auxiliary unknowns

$$\mathcal{U}_\sigma(t,x_3)=\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^\sigma_h},$$
$$F(t,x_3)=C\int_0^t f\left(t',x_3\right)\mathrm{d}t'.$$

With these substitutions (5.14) becomes

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathcal{U}^2_\sigma(x_3)+\left(c\nu-2C\,f(t,x_3)-2\nu\partial_3^2\right)\mathcal{U}^2_\sigma(t,x_3)\leqslant 0.$$

By the use of use Duhamel formula on the above equation to obtain the bound

$$\left\|\mathcal{U}_\sigma(t)\right\|_{L^p_v}\leqslant\left\|e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}\,t+F}\sqrt{\mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\,\mathcal{U}^2_\sigma}\right\|_{L^p_v}.$$

The function F is bounded in L^∞_v thanks to the results in Lemma 5.9, hence again as in the proof of Lemma 5.9 we can argue that

$$\left\|\mathcal{U}_\sigma(t)\right\|_{L^p_v}\leqslant\ C\ \exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right\}e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}\,t}\left\|\mathcal{U}_{\sigma,0}\right\|_{L^p_v},$$

for any $p\in[4,\infty]$. The bound (5.11) is then proved

For the inequality (5.12) the procedure is the same but slightly more involved. We recall that the following bound holds true for zer-horizontal average vector fields:

$$\begin{aligned}(5.15)\quad\left(\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\cdot\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\middle|\,\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)_{H^\sigma_h}&\leqslant\frac{\nu}{2}\left\|\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}\\&\quad+C\,K^2\ \left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}.\end{aligned}$$

We postpone the proof of (5.15) at page 41.
The same considerations as above lead us to the bound

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\Omega^2_\sigma(t,x_3)+\left(\frac{c\nu}{2}-C\,K^2\,f(t)-\nu\partial_3^2\right)\Omega^2_\sigma(t,x_3)\leqslant 0,$$

where

$$\Omega_\sigma(t,x_3)=\left\|\omega^h(t,\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^\sigma_h},$$
$$f(t,x_3)=\left\|\bar{u}^h(t,\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\omega^h(t,\cdot,x_3)\right\|^2_{L^2_h}.$$

With the use of Duhamel formula we hence deduce that

$$\left\|\Omega_\sigma(t)\right\|_{L^p_v}\leqslant Ce^{-c\nu t}\left\|e^F\sqrt{\mathcal{H}_v(t,2\nu)\,\Omega^2_{\sigma,0}}\right\|_{L^p_v},$$

Where again

$$F(t,x_3)=CK^2\int_0^t f\left(t',x_3\right)\mathrm{d}t'.$$

The function $e^F\in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}^1_v\right)$ thanks to the results in Lemma 5.9 and the estimate (5.11), hence we deduce the bound

$$\left\|e^F\right\|_{L^\infty_v}\leqslant\ C\exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\omega^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}}{c\nu}\exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right\}\right\},$$

which lead to the final bound

$$\|\Omega_\sigma(t)\|_{L^p_v} \leqslant C\ \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\omega_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}}{c\nu}\exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right\}\right\}e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}t}\left\|\Omega^2_{\sigma,0}\right\|_{L^p_v},$$

for $p\in[4,\infty]$.
Since The application $\omega^h\mapsto\nabla_h\bar{u}^h$ is a Calderòn-Zygmung application we can conlude with the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^p_v(H^\sigma_h)}\\&\leqslant CK\ \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}}{c\nu}\exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right\}\right\}e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}t}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L^p_v(H^\sigma_h)},\end{aligned}$$

which proves (5.12). □

Proof of Proposition 5.6 At this point the proof of Proposition 5.6 is direct corollary of Lemma 5.10. Since the vector field $\bar{u}^h$ has zero horizontal average the following equivalence of norms hold true

$$\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^\sigma_h}\sim\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^{\sigma+1}_h}$$

It is sufficient in fact to remark now that, for vector fields with zero horizontal average, the embedding $H^{1+\sigma}\left(\mathbb{R}^2_h\right)\hookrightarrow L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^2_h\right),\sigma>0$ holds true. I.e.

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{L^\infty_h}\leqslant C\ \left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^{\sigma+1}_h}.$$

These considerations together with the inequality (5.12) (seeting $p=\infty$) lead us to the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\\&\leqslant CK\ \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}}{c\nu}\exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right\}\right\}e^{-\frac{c\nu}{2}t}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}_0^h\right\|_{L^p_v(H^\sigma_h)}.\end{aligned}$$

An integration-in-time completes hence the proof of Proposition 5.6. □

Proof of (5.15). This is the only part of the present paper in which we use the anisotropic (horizontal) paradifferential calculus introduced at page 13. We recall that, given two functions $f,g\in H^\sigma_h$

$$(f|g)_{H^\sigma_h}\sim\sum_{q\in\mathbb{Z}}2^{2q\sigma}\left(\triangle^h_qf\middle|\triangle^h_qg\right)_{L^2_h}.$$

This deduction is a consequence of the almost-orthogonality property of dyadic blocks. Whence it is sufficient to prove bounds for terms of the form

$$\begin{aligned}A_q&=\left(\triangle^h_q\left(\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\cdot\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)\middle|\triangle^h_q\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)_{L^2_h},\\&=\left(\triangle^h_q\left(\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\,\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)\middle|\triangle^h_q\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)_{L^2_h}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the (horizontal) Bony decomposition (1.8) we decompose A_q into the following infinite sum

$$\begin{aligned}
A_q =& \left(\triangle_q^h \left(\bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right) \middle| \triangle_q^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right)_{L_h^2}, \\
=& \sum_{|q-q'| \leqslant 4} \left(\triangle_q^h \left(S_{q'-1}^h \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \triangle_{q'}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right) \middle| \triangle_q^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right)_{L_h^2}, \\
&+ \sum_{q' > q-4} \left(\triangle_q^h \left(\triangle_{q'}^h \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) S_{q'+1}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right) \middle| \triangle_q^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right)_{L_h^2}, \\
=& A_q^1 + A_q^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We start bounding the term A_q^1. We recall that thanks to Bernstein inequality the operator $\triangle_q^h$ maps continuously any H_h^σ space to itself.
Using Hölder inequality (twice)

$$\left| A_q^1 \right| \leqslant \sum_{|q-q'| \leqslant 4} \left\| \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^4} \left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^4} \left\| \triangle_q^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}.$$

Thanks to the Remark 5.4 we know that $\bar{u}^h$ and ω^h are vector fields with zero horizontal average for each x_3. Hence we can use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg-type inequality (1.11), to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^4} &\leqslant C \left\| \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} \left\| \nabla_h \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2}, \\
\left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^4} &\leqslant C \left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} \left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the application $\omega^h \mapsto \nabla_h \bar{u}^h$ is a Calderon-Zygmung application we can say that, there exists a K constant independent by any parameter of the problem such that

$$\left\| \nabla_h \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} \leqslant K^{1/2} \left\| \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2}.$$

Moreover for vector fields whose horizontal average is zero the embedding $H_h^\sigma \hookrightarrow L_h^2, \sigma > 0$ holds true, hence

$$\left\| \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} \leqslant C \left\| \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma}^{1/2}.$$

Since there exists a $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z})$ sequence such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} \left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} &\leqslant C c_{q'} \, 2^{-q'\sigma} \left\| \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma}^{1/2} \left\| \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma}^{1/2}, \\
\left\| \triangle_q^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2} &\leqslant C c_q 2^{-q\sigma} \left\| \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma},
\end{aligned}$$

we formally deduced the bound

$$\left| A_q^1 \right| \leqslant C K^{1/2} c_q 2^{-2q\sigma} \left\| \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma}^{1/2} \left\| \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}^{1/2} \left\| \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma}^{1/2} \left\| \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{H_h^\sigma}^{3/2}.$$

It remains to prove the same kind of bound for the term A_q^2. Again, using Hölder inequality

$$\left| A_q^2 \right| \leqslant \sum_{q' > q-4} \left\| \triangle_{q'}^h \bar{u}^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^4} \left\| S_{q'+2}^h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^4} \left\| \triangle_q^h \nabla_h \omega^h \left(\cdot, x_3 \right) \right\|_{L_h^2}.$$

Since the vector fields have zero horizontal average we can apply (1.11), the fact that $\omega^h \mapsto \nabla_h \bar{u}^h$ is a Calderon-Zygmund operator and (1.10) to deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\triangle^h_{q'}\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{L^4_h} &\leqslant C\left\|\triangle^h_{q'}\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h}\left\|\triangle^h_{q'}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h},\\ &\leqslant CK^{1/2}\left\|\triangle^h_{q'}\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h}\left\|\triangle^h_{q'}\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h},\\ &\leqslant CK^{1/2}\,c_q 2^{-q'\sigma}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}.\end{aligned}$$

Using (1.11) and the embedding $H^\sigma_h \hookrightarrow L^2_h$ which hods for vector fields with zero horizontal average

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|S^h_{q'+2}\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{L^4_h} &\leqslant C\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h}\left\|\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h},\\ &\leqslant C\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence with the aid of (1.10)

$$\left\|\triangle^h_q\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{L^2_h} \leqslant Cc_q 2^{-q\sigma}\left\|\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|_{H^\sigma_h}.$$

We hence deduced that

$$|A^2_q| \leqslant CK^{1/2}c_q 2^{-2q\sigma}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{3/2}_{H^\sigma_h}.$$

With these bounds we hence proved that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\cdot\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\middle|\,\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right)_{H^\sigma_h}\\ &\qquad\leqslant CK^{1/2}\left\|\bar{u}^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{L^2_h}\left\|\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{1/2}_{H^\sigma_h}\left\|\nabla_h\omega^h(\cdot,x_3)\right\|^{3/2}_{H^\sigma_h}.\end{aligned}$$

To deduce the estimate (5.15) it is sufficient hence to apply the convexity inequality $ab \leqslant \frac{C^4}{4}a^4 + \frac{3}{4C^{4/3}}b^{4/3}$ to the above estimate. □

5.1.2. *Propagation of isotropic Sobolev regularity.* We apply in this Section the result proved in the previous one in order to conclude the proof of Proposition 5.5.

Proof of Proposition 5.5. Let us apply the operator $\triangle_q$ to both sides of (5.7) and let us multiply what we obtain with $\triangle_q\bar{u}^h$ and let us take scalar product in $L^2\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$, we obtain in particular

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} + \nu\left\|\triangle_q\nabla\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant \left|\left(\triangle_q\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right)\middle|\,\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|, \tag{5.16}$$

whence to obtain the claim everything reduces to bound the term $\left|\left(\triangle_q\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right)\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|$. By Bony decomposition (1.9) we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\left(\triangle_q\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right)\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right| &\leqslant \left|\left(S_{q-1}\bar{u}^h\triangle_q\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right| \\ &+\sum_{|q-q'|\leqslant 4}\left\{\left|\left(\left[\triangle_q,S_{q'-1}\bar{u}^h\right]\triangle_{q'-1}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|+\left|\left(\left(S_q-S_{q'-1}\right)\bar{u}^h\triangle_q\triangle_{q'-1}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|\right\} \\ &+\sum_{q'>q-4}\left|\left(\triangle_q\left(S_{q'+2}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\triangle_{q'-1}\bar{u}^h\right)\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|=\sum_{k=1}^{4}I_k.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\operatorname{div}_h\bar{u}^h=0$ we immediately obtain that $I_1\equiv 0$, whence if we consider the second term, thanks to Hölder inequality and Lemma 1.8 we can argue that

$$I_2\leqslant C\sum_{|q-q'|\leqslant 4}2^{-q}\left\|S_{q'-1}\nabla\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\triangle_{q'-1}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}.$$

Accordingly to Bernstein inequality we have that

$$\left\|S_{q'-1}\nabla\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\leqslant C2^{q'}\left\|S_{q'-1}\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)},$$

and hence, since $\|\triangle_q f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\leqslant Cc_q(t)\,2^{-qs}\|f\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}$ we obtain that

$$I_2\leqslant Cc_q2^{-2qs}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}.$$

Similar calculations lead to the same bound for I_3, i.e.

$$I_3\leqslant Cc_q2^{-2qs}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}.$$

Finally form the reminder term I_4 the following computations hold

$$\begin{aligned}I_4&=\sum_{q'>q-4}\left|\left(\triangle_q\left(S_{q'+2}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\triangle_{q'-1}\bar{u}^h\right)\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right| \\ &\leqslant\sum_{q'>q-4}\left\|S_{q'+2}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\triangle_{q'-1}\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)},\end{aligned}$$

but, since we are dealing with localized functions

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|S_{q'+2}\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}&\leqslant 2^{q'}\left\|S_{q'+2}\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)},\\ \left\|\triangle_{q'-1}\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}&\leqslant c_{q'}2^{-q's-q'}\left\|\nabla\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}.\\ \left\|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}&\leqslant c_q2^{-qs}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)},\end{aligned}$$

whence we obtain

$$I_4\leqslant Cc_q2^{-2qs}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\nabla\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)},$$

which in particular implies that

$$\left|\left(\triangle_q\left(\bar{u}^h\cdot\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right)\right|\triangle_q\bar{u}^h\right)_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|\leqslant Cc_q2^{-2qs}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}. \tag{5.17}$$

Whance inserting (5.17) into (5.16), multiplying both sides for 2^{2qs} and summing over q we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}+\nu\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\leqslant C\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}, \tag{5.18}$$

whence by Young inequality

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\leqslant\frac{\nu}{2}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}+C\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)},$$

which, together with (5.18) and a Gronwall argument lead to the following estimate

$$\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}+\nu\int_0^t\left\|\bar{u}^h(\tau)\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)}\mathrm{d}\tau\leqslant C\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\exp\left\{\int_0^t\left\|\bar{u}^h(\tau)\right\|^2_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\mathrm{d}\tau\right\}.$$

We can hence apply on the above inequality Proposition 5.6 to deduce the bound

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\bar{u}^h(t)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}+\nu\int_0^t\left\|\bar{u}^h(\tau)\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)}\mathrm{d}\tau\leqslant C\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\\&\times\exp\left\{\frac{CK}{c\nu}\ \exp\left\{\frac{CK^2\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}}{c\nu}\exp\left\{\frac{K}{c\nu}\left(1+\left\|\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right)\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|^2_{L^\infty_v(L^2_h)}\right\}\right\}\left\|\nabla_h\bar{u}^h_0\right\|_{L^p_v(H^\sigma_h)}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

□

5.2. **The oscillating part: propagation of $H^s(\mathbb{T}^3), s>1/2$ data.** In this section we consider the propagation of Sobolev regularity for the equation (4.2) satisfied (distributionally) by the function U_{osc}. We proved in Section 4.2 that for almost all three-dimensional tori $\mathbb{T}^3$ the equation for U_{osc} is linear. The result claimed is hence the following:

Proposition 5.11. *Let $U_{\mathrm{osc},0}\in H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)$, $s>1/2$, suppose $\bar{U}=(\bar{u}^h,0,0)$ solution of (5.3) is globally defined and $\bar{u}^h\in L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s+1})$, hence the solution U_{osc} of the system (4.2) satisfies*

$$U_{\mathrm{osc}}\in\mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)\right)\cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)\right),$$

and the following estimates hold for each $t>0$

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|U_{\mathrm{osc}}(t)\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}+\frac{\nu+\nu'}{2}\int_0^t\left\|U_{\mathrm{osc}}(\tau)\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)}\mathrm{d}\tau\\\leqslant C\left\|U_{\mathrm{osc},0}\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\exp\left\{C\left\|\nabla\bar{u}^h\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^s(\mathbb{T}^3))}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

For a proof for Proposition 5.11 we refer to [20, Appendix B].

6. Convergence for $\varepsilon\to0$ and proof of Theorem 1.5

The previous section has been devoted to the study of the global-well-posedness of the limit system $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ in some super-critical $H^s(\mathbb{T}^3), s>1/2$ Sobolev space. The present section shall use this result to prove that, for $0<\varepsilon\leqslant\varepsilon_0$ sufficiently small the (local, strong) solutions of $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$ converge (globally) in the space

$$\mathcal{C}\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)\right)\cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3)\right),$$

to the now global and strong solution U of $(\mathcal{S}_0)$. This shall imply that as long as ε is sufficiently close to zero the strong solutions of $(\mathrm{PBS}_\varepsilon)$ are in fact global.

The method we are going to explain reduces to a smart choice of variable substitution that cancels some problematic term appearing in the equations. This technique has been introduced by S. Schochet in [28] in the context of hyperbolic systems with singular perturbation. I. Gallagher

in [20] adapted the method to parabolic systems. We mention as well the work of M. Paicu [25] and E.Grenier [21].
Let us subtract $(\mathcal{S}_0)$ from $(\mathcal{S}_\varepsilon)$, and we denote the difference unknown by $W^\varepsilon = U^\varepsilon - U$. After some basic algebra we reduced hence ourselves to the following difference system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t W^\varepsilon + \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon\left(W^\varepsilon, W^\varepsilon + 2U\right) - \nu\Delta W^\varepsilon = -\left(\mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon\left(U,U\right) - \mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)\right), \\ \operatorname{div} W^\varepsilon = 0, \\ W^\varepsilon|_{t=0} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

We define $\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}} = \mathcal{Q}^\varepsilon\left(U,U\right) - \mathcal{Q}\left(U,U\right)$. We remark that $\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}} \to 0$ only in $\mathcal{D}'$,since it is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}\neq 0 \\ j=1,2,3}} e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}}\left(u^{a,j}\left(k\right)k_j U^b\left(n-k\right)\Big|\, e^c\left(n\right)\right)e^c\left(n\right)\right),$$

hence we divide it in high-low frequencies in the following way, for the low-frequency part

$$\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc},N} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1_{\{|n|\leqslant N\}}\sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}\neq 0 \\ j=1,2,3}} 1_{\{|k|\leqslant N\}} e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}}\left(u^{a,j}\left(k\right)k_j U^b\left(n-k\right)\Big|\, e^c\left(n\right)\right)e^c\left(n\right)\right),$$

while the h-frequency part is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon,N}_{\text{osc}} = \mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}} - \mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc},N}.$$

First of all we claim that $\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon,N}_{\text{osc}} \xrightarrow{N\to\infty} 0$ in $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s-1}\right)$. This can be quickly proved by application of Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem as long as $\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}} \in L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s-1}\right)$. In fact if $s > 1/2$ we have that $\|\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}}\|_{H^{s-1}} \sim \|u\cdot\nabla U\|_{H^{s-1}} = \|U\otimes U\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}$. And the following product rule apply

$$\|U\otimes U\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \lesssim \|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T}^3)}\|U\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)},$$

while thanks to the embedding $H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right) \hookrightarrow L^\infty\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ for $s > 1/2$ we can finally say that $\|\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}}\|_{H^{s-1}} \lesssim \|U\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\|U\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}$, and hence

$$\|\mathcal{R}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc}}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s-1})} \lesssim \|U\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3))}\|U\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;H^s(\mathbb{T}^3))}.$$

This allows us to conclude that

$$\left\|\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon,N}_{\text{osc}}\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s-1})} \leqslant k_n \xrightarrow{N\to\infty} 0. \tag{6.2}$$

Let us now perform the following change of unknown

$$\psi^\varepsilon_N = W^\varepsilon + \varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc},N}, \tag{6.3}$$

where, in particular, $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc},N}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^\varepsilon_{\text{osc},N} = \mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1_{\{|n|\leqslant N\}}\sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}\neq 0 \\ j=1,2,3}} 1_{\{|k|\leqslant N\}}\frac{e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}}}{i\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}}\left(u^{a,j}\left(k\right)k_j U^b\left(n-k\right)\Big|\, e^c\left(n\right)\right)e^c\left(n\right)\right),$$

in particular we remark that $\partial_t\left(\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}\right)=\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}+\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon,t}_{\mathrm{osc},N}$, with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon,t}_{\mathrm{osc},N}=\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(1_{\{|n|\leqslant N\}}\sum_{\substack{\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}\neq 0\\ j=1,2,3}}1_{\{|k|\leqslant N\}}\frac{e^{i\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}}}{i\omega^{a,b,c}_{k,n-k,n}}\partial_t\left(u^{a,j}\left(t,k\right)k_jU^b\left(t,n-k\right)\Big|\,e^c\left(n\right)\right)e^c\left(n\right)\right).$$

Tanks to the definition (6.3) and system (6.1) we can deduce the equation satisfied by ψ^{ε}_N after some elementary algebraic manipulation, which is

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t\psi^{\varepsilon}_N+\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(\psi^{\varepsilon}_N,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N-2\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}+2U\right)-\nu\Delta\psi^{\varepsilon}_N=-\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon,N}_{\mathrm{osc}}-\Gamma^{\varepsilon}_N,\\ \text{div }\psi^{\varepsilon}_N=0,\\ \psi^{\varepsilon}_N|_{t=0}=\psi^{\varepsilon}_{N,0}=\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}\Big|_{t=0},\end{cases}\tag{6.4}$$

with Γ^{ε}_N defined as

$$\Gamma^{\varepsilon}_N=\nu\Delta\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}+\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N},\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}+2U\right)+\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon,t}_{\mathrm{osc},N}.$$

We outline that ψ^{ε}_N is divergence-free since it is a linear combination of the eigenvectors $e^0,e^{\pm}$ defined in (2.5) which are all divergence-free.

Now we claim that

Lemma 6.1. *Γ^{ε}_N is bounded in $L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s-1}\right)$ by a constant K_N which depends on N solely.*

This is usually referred as *small divisor estimate* in the literature. The proof is due to the fact that all the elements composing $\Gamma^{\varepsilon}_N=\Gamma^{\varepsilon}_N\left(U\right)$ are localised in the frequency space, hence they have all the regularity we want them to have at the cost of some power of N. We omit a detailed proof only for the sake of brevity, but this can be deduced thanks to the energy estimates performed on U in the previous section.

Let us, at this point, perform an $H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)$ energy estimate on equation (6.4), we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|^2_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}+\nu\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\leqslant\left|\left(\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon,N}_{\mathrm{osc}}+\varepsilon\Gamma^{\varepsilon}_N+\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(\psi^{\varepsilon}_N,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N-2\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}+2U\right)\Big|\,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right)_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right|.\tag{6.5}$$

Now, if we consider two four component vector fields A,B such that their first three components are divergence-free it is indeed true that $\left\|\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(A,B\right)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\leqslant C\left\|A\otimes B\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$, we shall use repeatedly this property in what follows. We shall use as well the fact that $H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{R}^3\right)$ is a Banach algebra. Whence

$$\begin{aligned}&\left(\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(\psi^{\varepsilon}_N,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right)|\,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right)_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} &&\leqslant C\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\otimes\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)},\\ &&&\leqslant C\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|^2_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)},\\ &\left(\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(\psi^{\varepsilon}_N,2U\right)|\,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right)_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} &&\leqslant C\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\left\|U\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)},\\ &\left(\mathcal{Q}^{\varepsilon}\left(\psi^{\varepsilon}_N,2\varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}\right)\Big|\,\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right)_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} &&\leqslant C\varepsilon\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\left\|\psi^{\varepsilon}_N\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{\varepsilon}_{\mathrm{osc},N}\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}.\end{aligned}\tag{6.6}$$

Using the estimates in (6.6) into (6.5) and using repeatedly Young inequality $ab \leqslant \frac{\eta}{2}a^2 + \frac{1}{2\eta}b^2$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(6.7)\quad &\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \left(\frac{\nu}{2} - C\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right)\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \\ &\qquad\leqslant C\left(\|U\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \varepsilon\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2\right)\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + C\left\|\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{osc}}^{\varepsilon,N} + \varepsilon\Gamma_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^{s-1}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Whence let us define

$$(6.8)\qquad \frac{1}{2}\Theta(t) = C\left(\|U\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 + \varepsilon\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2\right),$$

by variation of constant method we transform (6.7) into

$$\begin{aligned}(6.9)\quad &\frac{1}{2}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\left(\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 e^{-\int_0^t\Theta(s)\mathrm{d}s}\right) + \left(\frac{\nu}{2} - C\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right)\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 e^{-\int_0^t\Theta(s)\mathrm{d}s} \\ &\qquad\leqslant C\left\|\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{osc}}^{\varepsilon,N} + \varepsilon\Gamma_N^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 e^{-\int_0^t\Theta(s)\mathrm{d}s}.\end{aligned}$$

Now we claim the following

Lemma 6.2. *The function $\Theta = \Theta_{\varepsilon,N}$ defined in (6.8) is an $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+)$ function uniformly in ε and N.*

Lemma 6.2 in particular asserts that there exists two constants $0 < c_1 \leqslant c_2$ such that $c_1 \leqslant \left|e^{-\int_0^t\Theta(s)\mathrm{d}s}\right| \leqslant c_2$ independently by $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, whence integrating (6.9) in time [1] , using the above consideration combined with Lemma 6.1 and (6.2) we transform (6.9) into

$$\begin{aligned}(6.10)\quad &\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(t)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \int_0^t\left(\nu - 2C\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(s)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}\right)\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(s)\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 e^{\int_s^t\Theta(s')\mathrm{d}s'}\mathrm{d}s \\ &\qquad\leqslant Cc_2\left(k_N + \varepsilon K_N\right) + \left\|\psi_{N,0}^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} e^{\int_0^t\Theta(s)\mathrm{d}s},\end{aligned}$$

where we used the following notation $\psi_{N,0}^\varepsilon = \psi_N^\varepsilon|_{t=0}$. Considering the definition of ψ_N^ε given in equation (6.3) we immediately deduce that $\psi_{N,0}^\varepsilon = \varepsilon\,\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon\Big|_{t=0}$, but in particular $\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon\Big|_{t=0}\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant K_N$ thanks to an argument similar to the one which proves Lemma 6.1, i.e. we exploit the fact that $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon$ is supported in a ball of radius N in the frequency space and hence we can gain all the integrability we want at the price of some power of N. Whence this combined with Lemma 6.1 and (6.2) gives that, considering first N big enough and hence ε small enough we obtain that

$$(6.11)\qquad \begin{aligned}\left\|\psi_{N,0}^\varepsilon\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} e^{\int_0^t\Theta(s)\mathrm{d}s} &\leqslant \frac{\eta}{2},\\ Cc_2\left(k_N + \varepsilon K_N\right) &\leqslant \frac{\eta}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thanks to the existence theorem given in Theorem 1.3 we can assert that the application $t \mapsto \left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(t)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}$ is continuous, hence, since we can consider $\left\|\psi_{N,0}^\varepsilon\right\|_H s$ as small as we want as long as ε is small as well it makes sense to define the time

$$(6.12)\qquad \tilde{T}_\varepsilon^\star = \sup\left\{0 \leqslant t \leqslant T^\star \,\middle|\, \left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(t)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant \frac{\nu}{4C}\right\}.$$

[1] This integration has to be meant, indeed, locally-in-time. In fact $\psi_N^\varepsilon = U^\varepsilon - U + \varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon$, now U and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon$ are globally-well-defined thanks to the global results stated and proved in Proposition 5.11 and 5.5, while U^ε, at this stage of the proof, exists only locally in $[0, T^\star]$ due to Theorem 1.3.

The definition of $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^\star$ implies that $\nu - 2C\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(s)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)} \leqslant \nu/2$ in $\left[0, \tilde{T}_\varepsilon^\star\right]$, and moreover, since $\left|e^{\int_s^t \Theta(s')\mathrm{d}s'}\right| \geqslant c_1$ and estimates (6.11) transform (6.10) in the following differential inequality

$$\left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(t)\right\|_{H^s(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \frac{\nu}{2}c_1\int_0^t \left\|\psi_N^\varepsilon(s)\right\|_{H^{s+1}(\mathbb{R}^3)}^2 \mathrm{d}s \leqslant \eta. \tag{6.13}$$

Now the bound on the right hand side of (6.13) is independent by t and arbitrary small, whence selecting $\eta < \frac{\nu^2}{16C^2}$ the condition (6.12) defining $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^\star$ is always satisfied, whence we can assert that $\tilde{T}_\varepsilon^\star = \infty$ (bootstrap) and hence we obtained the following result

Proposition 6.3. *Let ψ_N^ε be defined as in* (6.3) *and let it satisfy equation* (6.4)*, then for N sufficiently large and ε sufficiently small we can make ψ_N^ε as small as we want in the space*

$$L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

At this point the proof of Theorem 1.5 is a direct corollary of Proposition 6.3, since $\psi_N^\varepsilon = W^\varepsilon + \varepsilon\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon$ where $\left\|\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon\right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+;H^s(\mathbb{T}^3))\cap L^2(\mathbb{R}_+;H^{s+1}(\mathbb{T}^3))} \leqslant K_N$, i.e. $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathrm{osc},N}^\varepsilon$ is a $o_\varepsilon(1)$ corrector in the space $L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$, which means that ψ_N^ε and W^ε have comparable norms in the space $L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$, i.e. the norm of W^ε in the space $L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ is a variation of order ε of the norm ψ_N^ε in the same space, this implies that

$$W^\varepsilon \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right),$$

but since $W^\varepsilon = U^\varepsilon - U$, and U is globally well posed in the space $L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ as proved in Section 5 we finally deduce that, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small

$$U^\varepsilon \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

Moreover the bootstrap argument proved that $\psi_N^\varepsilon \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ in the space $L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$, hence being $W^\varepsilon = \psi_N^\varepsilon + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ in the space $L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right)$ we deduce as well that

$$W^\varepsilon = U^\varepsilon - U = \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{t}{\varepsilon}\right)V^\varepsilon - U \to 0 \qquad \text{in } L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^s\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right) \cap L^2\left(\mathbb{R}_+; H^{s+1}\left(\mathbb{T}^3\right)\right).$$

□

References

[1] Jean-Pierre Aubin, *Un théorème de compacité*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **256** (1963), 5042–5044.

[2] A. Babin, A. Mahalov, and B. Nicolaenko, *Global splitting, integrability and regularity of 3D Euler and Navier-Stokes equations for uniformly rotating fluids*, European J. Mech. B Fluids **15** (1996), no. 3, 291–300.

[3] ———, *Global regularity of 3D rotating Navier-Stokes equations for resonant domains*, Appl. Math. Lett. **13** (2000), no. 4, 51–57.

[4] Hajer Bahouri, Jean-Yves Chemin, and Raphaël Danchin, *Fourier analysis and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 343, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[5] Jean-Michel Bony, *Calcul symbolique et propagation des singularités pour les équations aux dérivées partielles non linéaires*, Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure **14** (1981), no. 2, 209–246 (fre).

[6] Didier Bresch, David Gérard-Varet, and Emmanuel Grenier, *Derivation of the planetary geostrophic equations*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **182** (2006), no. 3, 387–413.

[7] Frédéric Charve, *Global well-posedness and asymptotics for a geophysical fluid system*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **29** (2004), no. 11-12, 1919–1940.

[8] ———, *Convergence of weak solutions for the primitive system of the quasigeostrophic equations*, Asymptot. Anal. **42** (2005), no. 3-4, 173–209.

[9] Frédéric Charve and Van-Sang Ngo, *Global existence for the primitive equations with small anisotropic viscosity*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **27** (2011), no. 1, 1–38.

[10] J.-Y. Chemin and N. Lerner, *Flot de champs de vecteurs non lipschitziens et équations de Navier-Stokes*, J. Differential Equations **121** (1995), no. 2, 314–328.
[11] Jean-Yves Chemin, *À propos d'un problème de pénalisation de type antisymétrique*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **76** (1997), no. 9, 739–755.
[12] ———, *Perfect incompressible fluids*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 14, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1998, Translated from the 1995 French original by Isabelle Gallagher and Dragos Iftimie.
[13] Jean-Yves Chemin, Benoît Desjardins, Isabelle Gallagher, and Emmanuel Grenier, *Fluids with anisotropic viscosity*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **34** (2000), no. 2, 315–335, Special issue for R. Temam's 60th birthday.
[14] ———, *Anisotropy and dispersion in rotating fluids*, Nonlinear partial differential equations and their applications. Collège de France Seminar, Vol. XIV (Paris, 1997/1998), Stud. Math. Appl., vol. 31, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002, pp. 171–192.
[15] ———, *Ekman boundary layers in rotating fluids*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **8** (2002), 441–466 (electronic), A tribute to J. L. Lions.
[16] ———, *Mathematical geophysics*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 32, The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006, An introduction to rotating fluids and the Navier-Stokes equations.
[17] Benoit Cushman-Roisin and Jean-Marie Beckers, *Introduction to geophysical fluid dynamics: physical and numerical aspects*, vol. 101, Academic Press, 2011.
[18] Hiroshi Fujita and Tosio Kato, *On the nonstationary Navier-Stokes system*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova **32** (1962), 243–260.
[19] ———, *On the Navier-Stokes initial value problem. I*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **16** (1964), 269–315.
[20] I. Gallagher, *Applications of Schochet's methods to parabolic equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **77** (1998), no. 10, 989–1054.
[21] E. Grenier, *Oscillatory perturbations of the Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **76** (1997), no. 6, 477–498.
[22] E. Grenier and N. Masmoudi, *Ekman layers of rotating fluids, the case of well prepared initial data*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **22** (1997), no. 5-6, 953–975.
[23] Dragoş Iftimie, *The 3D Navier-Stokes equations seen as a perturbation of the 2D Navier-Stokes equations*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **127** (1999), no. 4, 473–517.
[24] Sergiu Klainerman and Andrew Majda, *Singular limits of quasilinear hyperbolic systems with large parameters and the incompressible limit of compressible fluids*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **34** (1981), no. 4, 481–524.
[25] Marius Paicu, *Étude asymptotique pour les fluides anisotropes en rotation rapide dans le cas périodique*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **83** (2004), no. 2, 163–242.
[26] ———, *Équation periodique de Navier-Stokes sans viscosité dans une direction*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **30** (2005), no. 7-9, 1107–1140.
[27] H. Poincaré, *Sur la précession des corps déformables*, Bulletin Astronomique, Serie I **27** (1910).
[28] Steven Schochet, *Fast singular limits of hyperbolic PDEs*, J. Differential Equations **114** (1994), no. 2, 476–512.
[29] Stefano Scrobogna, *Highly rotating fluids with vertical stratification for periodic data and anisotropic diffusion*, submitted.
[30] Elias M. Stein, *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals*, Princeton Mathematical Series, vol. 43, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, With the assistance of Timothy S. Murphy, Monographs in Harmonic Analysis, III.
[31] Klaus Widmayer, *Convergence to stratified flow for an inviscid 3d boussinesq system*, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.09216`.

IMB, Université de Bordeaux
351, cours de la Libération, Bureau 255, 33405 Talence , France
E-mail address: `stefano.scrobogna@math.u-bordeaux.fr`